

SLOVAKIA

VOL. II.

DECEMBER 1952

NO. 3



IN THIS ISSUE:

WHAT LED TO THE PROCLAMATION OF THE SLOVAK REPUBLIC

SLOVAKIA — WINTER WONDERLAND

CASTLES OF SLOVAKIA: TRENČÍN

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE SLOVAK REPUBLIC

THE STORY OF THE TWO "KRNOS"

THE PURGE IN PRAGUE

THEY WANTED TO BE FREE

THE SLOVAK ASSEMBLY AND GOVERNMENT

JÁNOŠÍK — THE SLOVAK ROBIN HOOD

EDWARD BENEŠ — STALIN'S STOOG

ARE THE SLOVAKS AND CZECHS TWO "CLOSELY
RELATED" NATIONS?

WHO SAID IT?: 17, 22, 27, 29, 32, 41, 51, 64



Edited and compiled by
PHILIP A. HROBAK

Published by
THE SLOVAK LEAGUE OF AMERICA

SLOVAKIA is published periodically by the Slovak League of America, a cultural and civic federation of Americans of Slovak descent.

The chief purpose of SLOVAKIA is to promote a better understanding and appreciation of the Slovak nation and its long struggle for freedom and independence.

As Americans, members of the Slovak League of America firmly believe that the Slovak nation, just as all nations, has an inherent and God-given right to freedom and independence. They are dedicated to the cause of the American way of life, Slovak freedom and world peace and are determined to oppose the plague of Communism and all other totalitarian political systems.

Subscription to Slovakia \$1.00 per year in the U. S. A. — \$2.00 elsewhere.

Send subscriptions to:

S L O V A K I A

Box 150

Middletown, Pa.

Printed in the U. S. A.

JEDNOTA PRESS

Middletown, Pa.

What Led to the

PROCLAMATION OF THE SLOVAK REPUBLIC

KAROL SIDOR

(Former Ambassador of Slovakia to the Vatican)

Our great Svetozár Hurban Vajanský once wrote the following encouraging words:

"... fear not the proximity of events and do not be afraid of too small a perspective. Our elders sinned grievously in that respect. In folio form, they published the war of the divine Titan against the Jews; they wrote enormous volumes about America and Palestine; and histories about the cavalry units of Cracow and water nymphs. But they left us practically nothing about themselves and about their times; that is, they did not leave us their views and opinions so that we, their successors, now stand before a dark corner, about which we know only that in it our nation breathed, worked, suffered, bled, sinned, performed good works, quarreled and harmoniously formed associations, hated and loved. We — the unfortunate heirs of indolent fathers — have nothing in our hands"

So that a similar verdict be not rendered against us in the future, we must write about everything — about everything that we authored or at least were witnesses of, about everything we saw with our own eyes and heard with our own ears.

Such a testimony, of course, cannot be anything but subjective. But after a greater lapse of time, future historians will be able to form from various such subjective testimonies an objective picture about the events and the people of that particular time.

The question of Slovak statehood was dealt with in a speech delivered on February 21, 1939, by the premier of the Slovak Government, Dr. Joseph Tiso, who said:

"After a pause of a thousand years, after long years of fighting for its national rights, the Slovak nation has its own government, its own parliament, and is itself building its own state. Here on the floor of our own parliament, we are building our own State, our own new State, our own Slovak State. The Slovak nation is building its own State, which is the organ of its sovereignty, the executor of its will and the defender of its interests. Never again must it happen that the Slovak nation be placed in opposition to its own State. Being a Slovak patriot and an ideal nationalist means being a loyal builder of the Slovak State. Love for the Slovak nation is demonstrated concretely by loyalty and devotion to the Slovak State. We do not uphold the State just for the sake of having a State, but because, and only as long as, the nation needs it."

In these words Dr. Tiso indicated only the road we were to travel in building our own Slovak State in the future. "Here on the floor of our own parliament we are building our own State, our own new State, our own Slovak State" — that was the directive for the future.

When Dr. Joseph Tiso delivered his speech in the Slovak Assembly on February 21, 1939, he was well aware of the fact that we still did not have a Slovak State. There did exist an autonomous Slovak Government and a Slovak parliament, but that was not enough to al-

low us to speak about the Slovak State as an already existing formation. There was still lacking the proclamation of the State, its recognition by foreign powers, and we also lacked that which makes a State a State: our own army and our own representatives in other countries.

The Slovaks who noted the number of times the words "Slovak State" were mentioned in Tiso's speech before the Slovak Parliament could be completely satisfied. And the Slovaks were satisfied, but the Czechs became discontented.

Czech dissatisfaction was demonstrated not only in newspapers, but also in the sessions of the Central Government in Prague. In the sessions of that government, as a State Minister, I urged the Czechs to fulfill everything they had bound themselves to fulfill by paragraphs of the Constitutional Document which was adopted in the Prague Parliament on November 22, 1938. The Slovak Government had entrusted me to concern myself with common problems in Prague, the question of foreign affairs, finances and the army. I made concrete the Slovak demands and requested the Central Government to take a stand on them, approve them and hasten their realization.

On Wednesday, March 1, 1939, at four o'clock in the afternoon, the Council of Ministers was in session in Prague. Present were the Czechs: Rudolph Beran, the Premier of the Government, and ministers Chvalkovský, Syrový, Kalfus, Havelka, Krejčí, and Fischer. The Slovaks were represented by Karol Sidor, Stephen Haššík (for military affairs) and Dr. Alexander Hrnčár (for financial affairs). I presented our demands in the military and financial departments.

The first to reply was Premier Rudolph Beran. He said that two matters were involved: fundamental questions and partial demands. The entire Czech public, according to Beran, is condemning Tiso's speech in the Slovak Parliament in which he proclaimed that the Slovaks are building their own State, their own Slovak State, on the floor of parliament, and completely neglected to mention the Czecho-Slovak Republic even once. Beran demanded the Slovak Government to publicize its loyalty to the Czecho-Slovak Republic, otherwise it would not be possible to act on the partial demands which were presented to him by me. "We must either come to an agreement," said Beran, "or part." We cannot circumvent this question on tiptoes as we would a corpse. We cannot deny that a dangerous situation exists, added Beran, because it could overwhelm not only the Czech Government, but the Slovak Government as well.

When I was permitted to reply to Premier Beran, I said:

"We are not going to publish any fundamental manifestations about our loyalty to the Czecho-Slovak Republic. The Czechs and the Slovaks have accepted the law about the autonomy of Slovakia, and that law must not be neglected by the Czechs. The Slovak party is fulfilling what is in that law, because we, too, voted for that law, as we also voted for the joint State budget for the year 1939. The Slovak Government is responsible for the State in Slovakia, and the Czech Government cannot have guardianship over it. That we should continually have to express ourselves for the Czecho-Slovak Republic is nauseous particularly to me, because even during the First Republic I did not have to keep giving testimony of my loyalty to the State and, as far as I am concerned, I am not willing to do so even

now. During the life of the First Republic, Slovaks in Government wanted to gain the trust of the Czechs and they stressed their reliability in such a manner that they never said the words "Slovak" and "Slovakia" separately, but always added, when they said Slovakia: and our beloved Czecho-Slovak Republic. And when they used the word "Slovaks," they immediately added: and our dearly loved brethren, the Czechs. The healthy reaction to this unnatural status is what is happening in Slovakia today, i.e. that only Slovakia and the Slovaks are stressed. We shall mention the Republic and the Czechs only after the Republic and the Czechs accept everything they have bound themselves to do by the law pertaining to the autonomy of Slovakia. I must say that since October 6th nothing has changed as far as the will of the Czechs is concerned."

After I said these words, a bitter debate followed. Most important were those spoken by Chvalkovský, Minister of Foreign Affairs. He said:

"Whatever we have done thus far, we have not done well — neither you, nor we. We stand before the question: Shall we still stay together, or shall we part. An English statesman once said: a door must be either opened or closed. Every breeze cannot play with it. I was shocked by what Sidor has said, that from October 6th nothing has changed Slovakia. Never in history did Slovakia have a Slovak Government. She has one since October 6th, and that in itself means that since October 6th much has changed in Slovakia. Since October 6th we did not have time enough to look each other in the eye. We had to worry about our relationship with our neighbors, there were armies of three States on the territory of the Republic, and we could not resolve our internal relationship speedily. We, too, have a discontented mass of people, which is demanding that we correct the mistakes of the past and avoid mistakes in the present. I am not responsible for the past regime, but neither is Sidor. I am doing whatever I can do. In the history of foreign ministers, nowhere will you find a minister who had received 27 ultimatums within such a short time. Most of them are from the Magyars and the Poles decrying the conduct of the Slovak and Ruthenian Governments. Thus, it is very difficult for me to make order abroad, when these Governments, contrary to the Constitutional Document, also intervene in foreign affairs. Every week, with dispassionate persistence, I am in Hitler's office seeking recognition of Czecho-Slovakia's boundaries, and all I get is an evasive answer along with pointing to the unsettled internal affairs of the State. The deputies from Prague are saying that the question of the parting of the Slovaks and the Czechs is only a matter of weeks, and at most one of months. The effect abroad is that we are not recognized as a subject of international law, but only as an object. I demand that the Slovak Government state officially that it is for the Czecho-Slovak Republic. If the Slovak Government decides otherwise, we shall part. The Czech nation shall not stand in the way of your proclaiming the independence of Slovakia. It is better if this happens voluntarily."

Again I answered that the Slovak Government will not make any manifestation of loyalty to the Czecho-Slovak Republic as long as all the Slovak demands, emanating from the agreement between the Czechs and the Slovaks, are not fulfilled.

Premier Beran closed the lively meeting of the Ministerial Council with the remark that the following week the plenum of the Central Government, of which the Slovak ministers headed by Dr. Tiso are also members, shall meet to definitely resolve fundamental questions and partial programs, "since this could not be done through Sidor."

The situation developed rapidly. I returned home to Bratislava and requested the President of the Slovak Government, Dr. Joseph Tiso, to call a joint meeting of the Slovak Government, the Executive Committee of the Slovak Assembly and the Executive Committee of Hlinka's Slovak Peoples Party.

That meeting was held in Bratislava, on Monday, March 6, 1939. There I reported what had transpired thus far in Prague and requested that we clearly style the question of the Slovak State for ourselves and also decide on the manner of proclaiming it, because, according to my conviction, the situation in Prague was already such that we could no longer reckon with a new reconciliation and further negotiation with the Czechs.

After a lengthy debate, the stand unanimously accepted was given form by the president of the Slovak Government, Dr. Tiso, as follows:

"To continue the building of the Slovak State in an evolutionary way and at this time not to proclaim the establishment immediately."

That stand was proper and reasonable. Every nation desires to have its own State, to build it in its own way. The Slovaks were building theirs on the floor of the Slovak Parliament and would proclaim it when the Slovak deputies, the duly elected representatives of the Slovak nation, deemed it proper to do so.

The following day, March 7, 1939, Dr. Arthur Seiss-Inquart came from Vienna to pay me a "social call." He told me that on this occasion he would like to talk with Dr. Joseph Tiso. I called Dr. Tiso to my residence, hence both of us were present during the conversation with Seiss-Inquart.

After a few social formalities, Seiss-Inquart turned to politics and remarked that the foreign situation was becoming very dangerous for the Slovak nation. Adolph Hitler, he said, was ready to act severely against the entire Czecho-Slovak Republic. It is in the interest of the Slovaks not to become victims along with the Czechs, but to save themselves by establishing their own Slovak State.

Thereupon, Dr. Joseph Tiso explained what he had decided upon yesterday, that is, that we wanted to build the Slovak State in an evolutionary manner and did not wish to proclaim it right now. "To Slovak State independence," Dr. Joseph Tiso said, "we would like to come by a peaceful march toward our goal, possibly by running toward it."

"It is no longer enough," answered Seiss-Inquart, "to march peacefully toward the goal, or even running toward it. You must jump, because only by doing so will you attain your goal."

The joint conference with the Czechs was supposed to take place March 9th. I had agreed with premier Dr. Tiso that I would go to Prague alone and would let him know by phone whether it would still be necessary for him and also the rest of the Slovak ministers to come to Prague.

I arrived in Prague in the evening of March 8th. I ascertained how the situation there sharpened against the Slovaks and, therefore, that same evening I phoned to Bratislavá, telling Dr. Tiso to stay home and not to come to Prague.

On March 9, at 4 p. m., the Ministerial Council held a meeting in Prague. Present with me were all three delegates of the Slovak Government: Dr. Joseph Zvrškovec (Foreign Affairs), Stephen Haššík, (Military Affairs), and Dr. Alexander Hrnčár (Financial Affairs). At the start of the session, Premier Beran suddenly announced that a secret meeting of the Ministerial Council was about to take place and requested all three delegates of the Slovak Government to leave the assembly room. I remained in the room with Minister Paul Teplánsky.

In an angered tone Beran said that in all the embassies of Prague the exact time of the proclamation of the independent State of Slovakia was known and that only the Prague Government knew nothing about it.

I replied that such rumors were inundating the whole of Slovakia, but that we had not come to Prague to establish the truth or falsehood of such rumors. We had come to present the Slovak demands and have the Central Government accept and approve them. We must talk about the concrete matters; these the delegates of the Slovak Government have prepared and, therefore, I asked that they be invited to the conference.

My request was heard. In an atmosphere that threatened to explode, the three delegates of the Slovak Government and I presented the Slovak demands. Delegate Stephen Haššík was so overwrought that Beran had to remind him to compose himself when he began to pound the green table sharply with his fist. Such a thing, he said, had never before happened in the Ministerial Council.

When the tension was highest, a messenger came from the foyer to tell me that Minister Dr. Havelka wanted me on the phone. Dr. Havelka was an aide to President Hácha at the Hrad (Castle). He requested me to come to the Hrad at once; President Hácha urgently wished to speak with me.

I returned to the conference room and said to Stephen Haššík: "Here is my briefcase; take it home with you if I do not return. President Hácha has called for me, and I sense that it may be nothing good."

Informing Beran that I was summoned to the Castle, I left the Ministerial Council a little before midnight.

On the ground floor of the building a police officer told me that I was to be held. I protested against this so vociferously that the whole building of the Ministerial Council resounded with my protest. My detention, however, was soon explained, and I hurried to the Castle. After greeting President Hácha with a "good evening," I protested to him against the violation of my congressional immunity. Hácha knew nothing about it and painfully grasped his head. He was an old, overworked man, but an honest and good man. Catching his breath, he said stutteringly:

"Several moments ago I performed a very unpleasant task. I dismissed the premier of the Slovak Government, Dr. Tiso, and three

other ministers from their posts. I had to do it, because the consolidation of conditions in Slovakia demanded it."

I leaped from my chair and replied: "Mr. President, I cannot agree with the step you have taken. I am joining with the dismissed ministers and, here and now, tender you my resignation. I have nothing more to do in Prague."

The President was quite moved as he stood up and begged me not to resign and not let myself be overcome by hasty anger.

"With full knowledge of what may happen to me here in Prague for my statement," I said quietly and seriously, "I repeat that I do not agree with what you have done; I protest against it and hereby tender you my resignation. I am going home to Slovakia on the very next train."

President Háchá mopped his forehead and head with both hands and in a voice completely broken asked me again not to resign, because, he said, it would result in immense harm for Slovakia.

"I have nothing to add to what I have said," I replied and began walking toward the door. The President caught up with me, grasped my arm, and pleaded that I tarry a bit longer. "Beran will soon be here," he said. And at that very moment, the door burst open and Beran walked in hurriedly. Still standing near the door, I related to Beran what I had told Háchá: I was resigning and going home.

Háchá and Beran, however, entreated me to stay on. They were convinced, they said, with regard to conditions in Slovakia, that I was not doing the right thing. I gave in to them to the extent that I would announce my resignation to them from Bratislava after I had consulted with my friends.

As I left the President's office, in the corridor I met Peter Prídavok, who at that time was head of the press department of the Slovak Government, also Dr. Dobrovský, my secretary, and my aide, Lt. Fratrič. With my three friends I rode to my Prague residence.

In the morning of the next day, March 10th, I asked to get connected with the editorial office of the SLOVÁK in Bratislava. No one answered there. Then I tried to get connected with the General Secretariate of the Hlinka Slovak People's Party, but no one answered even there. Finally, they connected me with the Government Building in Bratislava. Dr. Karol Klinovský, Chief of the Security Service in Slovakia, answered the phone. I dictated a report to him to publish in the SLOVÁK, to wit, that "Sidor was placed before an accomplished fact in Prague in the matter of the dismissal of the Slovak ministers; he did not agree with the dismissal and protested against it to President Háchá." The report was then published in the SLOVÁK that very day, in the issue bearing the dateline of March 11, 1939.

At that time Dr. Klinovský told me that Martial Law was proclaimed in Slovakia without the knowledge of the Slovak Government. The Bratislava offices, editorial and secretarial, as well as the offices of the Hlinka Guard were occupied by the Czech Army and police. Over 250 Slovaks had been arrested, hundreds of officials were suspended, many Guards were taken into Moravia and hundreds of Slovaks had fled to Vienna to avoid arrest.

Something within me snapped. I could not believe that Háchá

and Beran were as faithless as T. G. Masaryk and Beneš and their adherents when it came to keeping agreements, solemn signatures and promises with the Slovaks. I really respected Hácha and Beran and believed that whatever they would promise and sign, they would also keep honorably and fulfill.

But, lo and behold, they were overthrowing the Slovak Government in Bratislava without the knowledge and behind the backs of the duly authorized representatives of the Slovak Government and its three delegates. Without the knowledge of the Slovak Government, they proclaimed Martial Law in Slovakia, occupied the territory of autonomous Slovakia with soldiers and gendarmes, arrested Slovak Deputies and hauled people to Moravia, while they were telling me that they were doing a very unpleasant duty in the "interest" of Slovakia. Anti-Slovak elements in Slovakia, encouraged by such measures, raised their heads on the streets and barked at the autonomists: "Now, we'll give you autonomy!"

While I was thinking about what was happening, the Czech Minister Feierabend came to my residence. He had a considerable understanding for Slovak matters. He told me that Beran had sent him to tell me to visit him at once.

"No!" I replied to Feierabend. "After yesterday's events in Prague and those that are happening in Slovakia now, I do not wish to speak with any one in Prague. Not even with you or Beran."

I remained in my residence with my friends. I waited for Dr. Martin Sokol, president of the Slovak Assembly, who had suddenly been called to Prague, to finish his audience with President Hácha. When he arrived, I traveled with him to Bratislava on the afternoon express.

I arrived in Bratislava at 9 P. M., March 10. A strong division of the Hlinka Guard awaited me at the station; also a stronger one of the Czech army, led by a Colonel. Masses of people climbed aboard the engine and thousands upon thousands milled around the square around the station. They sang marches of the Guard and acclaimed me vociferously. At the request of the Czech Colonel, on the way to the editorial office of the SLOVÁK, I stopped at the office of the General Voyta, Commander of the National Army in Slovakia. He was a tough soldier. But he saw the situation clearly and, it seemed to me, did not like it at all. When I complained that the army was shooting into the unarmed crowd in Bratislava, he replied that no one shot at the people, but a few salvos were fired into the air to frighten them. Later, I ascertained for myself that the Czech army in Bratislava really did not shoot any one. Anthony Kopal, the only Slovak who was felled by a bullet, was shot by a Czech gendarme. When I asked who had ordered the army and the tanks into the streets of Bratislava, Voyta told me that he personally was called to Prague by Syrový, Minister of National Defense, who ordered him to do so.

I requested Voyta to free all prisoners in Bratislava taken by his men. Voyta replied that he would as soon as he found out if any one was arrested in Bratislava; and that he would notify me.

Having appraised the situation at its source, I hurried to my car and continued on my way to the SLOVÁK, while a mass of 7000—

8000 people, gathered about Voyta's office, cheered and sang robustly.

When I arrived at the SLOVÁK, I found the higher officials of the Hlinka Party, headed by Dr. Tiso, already waiting for me. The entire executive body of the Assembly arrived and a lengthy deliberation began. Dr. Tiso, vice-president of the Party, presided at the session. He told about the situation that had developed in Bratislava, while Dr. Sokol and I related our experiences in Prague. I said that I would not go to Prague any more and requested that my resignation as State Minister be accepted by the conference. And forthwith, I proposed that the new Slovak Government be made up as follows:

Dr. Joseph Tiso, president of the Slovak Government; Dr. Martin Sokol, Minister of Interior; Joseph Sivák, Minister of Education; Julius Stano, Minister of Transportation; Dr. Peter Zaťko, Minister of Agriculture; Dr. Alex Hrnčár, Minister of Finance, and Dr. Gejza Fritz, Minister of Justice.

The conference decided — with only one dissenting vote, my own — that I should not resign, but continue in the office of State Minister. Dr. Joseph Tiso then announced that he could not assent to accept the office offered him. He stated that here he was not concerned about himself personally — all such thoughts must now be secondary — but that he did not want to place President Háchá into an unpleasant situation: he did not want Háchá pressed today to name as president of the Slovak Government that Tiso, whom he had yesterday dismissed from that office. The situation is serious — said Dr. Tiso — and we must not use the Slovak problem to enhance our personal interests and prestige. Slovakia needs a government, Tiso concluded, so that greater confusion and chaos would not ensue.

Thereupon, the conference authorized Dr. Martin Sokol to proceed as follows: If Dr. Joseph Tiso were not acceptable in Prague, then Karol Sidor should be proposed as president of the Slovak Government.

The next day, Saturday, March 11, 1939, the praesidium of the Slovak Assembly, presented the names of the new Slovak Government to President Háchá in Prague. This had to be done, because paragraph V, Article 4, of the Constitution of November 22, 1938, demanded it. It states: The members of the autonomous Slovak Government, forming a component part of the Central Government, shall be appointed by the President of the Republic on the motion of the praesidium of the Assembly of Slovakia.

President Dr. Emil Háchá approved the second alternative and named the new Slovak Government with me as its president. The other members of my government were: Sivák, Sokol, Stano, Zaťko, Hrnčár and Fritz. This, then, was the legal Slovak Government created according to the Constitutional Document which was valid at the time.

The very day that the news carried the names of the men constituting the new Slovak Government, I had several German visitors: editor Goldbach, then Carbus; later that night, close to midnight of March 11, W. William Kepler, special deputy of Adolph Hitler and Assistant Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Dr. Seiss-

Inquart, Governor of Austria, and Joseph Bürckel, Austrian gauleiter, who demanded that I immediately proclaim the independence of the Slovak State by radio either through the station in Bratislava or the one in Vienna.

I replied that responsible factors of the Hlinka Party and the Slovak Assembly had decided "to continue to build the Slovak State by an evolutionary process and not to proclaim its establishment right now." I explained that I, too, was bound by that decision and could not violate it without the assent of the Party and the Assembly. If the Assembly and the Party change their previous stand and on the floor of the Assembly, now decide to proclaim an independent Slovak State "right now," I would comply with that changed attitude. My actions were governed, I said, not by expediency or my personal fancies, but by the policy of the nation according to the directives which I had from competent Slovak organs. I take my orders only from them, I concluded, and I will not execute the orders and commands given me by representatives of another nation.

Naturally, the Germans were not satisfied with my answer. And they demonstrated their dissatisfaction in a very concrete fashion. On March 13, they vented their hatred of me by placing a bomb under my home in Bratislava to kill me and my whole family. I thanked God that it was discovered in time and rendered harmless. Another bomb was placed under the Jesuit monastery in Bratislava where Dr. Joseph Tiso resided. That bomb actually exploded and caused quite a bit of damage to the walls and windows of the structure. No one, however, was killed.

As soon as I took over the presidency of the Slovak Government all military regulations and orders, especially the proclamation of Martial Law, were revoked and rendered invalid. The putsch of the Czech generals, ordered by President Hácha and Premier Beran of the Central Government and executed by Syrový, Minister of National Defense, was thus liquidated. I liberated Slovak prisoners in Slovakia, returned all suspended persons to their jobs, and made certain military provisions to prevent any new putsches. The orders provided for the placement of Slovak officers as supervisors of the Slovak Government in all military formations which were headed by Czech generals and colonels. Simultaneously, President Hácha and General Syrový ordered all commanders of the army in Slovakia not to undertake any ventures without my knowledge or without the knowledge of the appointed Slovak officers.

This provision of mine I considered most important. It was thus that the Slovaks took over the command of the army in Slovakia before the proclamation of the independence of the Slovak State. That meant that the Slovaks took possession of one of the symbols of State sovereignty.

How important was this provision was demonstrated soon after the independence of the Slovak State was proclaimed, when the Magyars attacked the eastern borders of Slovakia, and our disciplined army, under the command of Lt. Colonel Augustine Malar, effectively resisted them. Without our military resistance, the Magyars would have occupied the eastern area of Slovakia even beyond

Prešov, just as they had occupied the whole of Ruthenia which offered no military resistance.

But even before the proclamation of the independence of the Slovak State, the knowledge that Slovak officers were in command of every military garrison in Slovakia evoked a remarkable satisfaction in the ranks of the Slovaks, who no longer had to fear that the barracks would again unload a host of soldiers who would fight against the people and its interests.

On Monday, March 13, 1939, at 6:00 A. M., Dr. Tiso arrived in Bratislava from Banovce to visit me. He told me that he had received an "invitation" to visit Adolph Hitler in Berlin and asked me whether I would agree that he go. I answered him that I did, but wanted it approved by my whole government as well as the praesidium of the Party and the Assembly. Thereupon, the Slovak Government, the praesidium of the Assembly and the Party were called to meet in the office of the SLOVÁK. The conference lasted until 12:30 P. M. The unanimous decision was: Dr. Joseph Tiso was to go to Berlin. After the conference, I issued the following official statement for the Bratislava press and radio:

"We announce to the Slovak public that today, Monday morning, the praesidium of the Hlinka Slovak People's Party had a meeting in Bratislava. At this meeting of the praesidium of the Party, Dr. Joseph Tiso, former President of the Slovak Government, announced that he had received an official summons from the Reich Chancellor, Adolph Hitler, to visit him at once in Berlin. The praesidium of the Party has acknowledged this invitation, and so has the Government of Karol Sidor. Consequently, Dr. Joseph Tiso crossed the border at Bratislava at noon today accompanied by the German Consul in Bratislava, deputy Stephen Danihel and deputy Ing. Karmasin. The purpose of Dr. Joseph Tiso's trip to Berlin is a clarification of the present situation."

In the instructions, which the conference gave to Dr. Joseph Tiso for his trip to Berlin, he was told: to hear what Hitler had to say, but not to give him any kind of binding statement; then to return to Bratislava and report on his visit to competent Slovak factors and await the definite decision of the Assembly, the Government and the Party.

Dr. Joseph Tiso visited Ribbentrop and Hitler in Berlin. After conversing with them, he went to the Czecho-Slovak embassy in Berlin, whence he phoned me and requested me to call the Slovak Assembly together. This telephone conversation took place with Tiso at 7:30 P. M. on March 13, 1939.

I immediately got in touch with President Hácha who, acting in accord with Paragraph V of the Constitution of November 22, 1938, called a meeting of the Slovak Assembly on March 14, 1939. The Slovak Assembly, therefore, was convened legally, in the manner prescribed by the Constitution of the Czecho-Slovak Republic.

Tuesday, March 14, 1939, at 9:00 A. M. the Slovak Government, the praesidium of the Assembly and the Hlinka Party convened in the Government Building at Bratislava. Dr. Joseph Tiso gave an exhaustive report about his trip to Berlin. The meeting approved his report enthusiastically; he had done the task he was asked to do. After the meeting, the Slovak Assembly convened in its quarters

for the session called by the President of the Republic, Dr. Emíl Hácha.

This memorable meeting of the Slovak Assembly opened at 10:57 A. M., March 14, 1939, by the Vice-President of the Assembly, Dr. Karol Mederly. After going through the formalities, Dr. Mederly, in accordance to Paragraph 37 of the order of business, moved that the remaining business of the Assembly be confidential. Therefore, only Deputies of the Assembly and members of the Slovak Government remained in the assembly hall. Of the 63 duly elected representatives of the Slovak Assembly, 57 were present at this historical session of the Slovak legislature.

The secret session began at 11:10 A. M. The first order of business was my speech, in which I depicted events as they had developed in Slovakia and recounted all that my Government had accomplished within so short a time. In my name and in the name of the other ministers, I announced the resignation of my government. I concluded my speech in this manner:

"... in the name of the entire Government I tender our resignations to this solemn Assembly. At this very moment, this my decision is being made known also to the constitutional factors in Prague and, with this, I proclaim the brief activity of my Government at an end. Sir Deputies, I pray that you be united, self-conscious and mutually trustworthy, because only thus shall we be able to get our Slovak nation out of the present difficult situation and establish order and stability and a solid front. I want to assure you, gentlemen, that I shall support with my whole strength and will everything that you shall decide. Long live the Slovak nation! Long live free Slovakia!"

Dr. Joseph Tiso then presented an extensive report on his trip to Berlin. In his introduction, Dr. Tiso stated that he made the trip to Berlin, because the conference of March 13th had decided that he do so. In Berlin, Dr. Tiso told foreign minister Joachim von Ribbentrop:

"... by initiative we Slovaks will never give the impulse to liquidate the Czecho-Slovak Republic. But if we see that the course of events is developing in such a way that it might be more beneficial to us, we shall consider it our duty to choose a suitable time to separate (from the Czechs). If our people see that events are tending in a direction indicating that the only way out is to make ourselves independent, then every Slovak will tighten his belt, live more frugally, will know how to bear up even under lesser advantages, and shall say to himself: under the given circumstances, there was nothing else we could do. Ribbentrop fully recognized and understood our position."

Then Dr. Tiso told about his visit with Adolph Hitler. The latter told him directly that the Magyars were preparing to occupy the whole of Slovakia at that time.

"And you must declare yourself against it," said Hitler... "and declare yourself with lightning speed. This declaration must be made to proper factors so that they would know that the Slovak nation has its own State, its own territory and that, therefore, it must prevent any one from making claims to enter Slovak territory and to the Slovak population. There is no time for waiting. Not days, but hours shall decide the issue."

Dr. Tiso thought for a moment, repeated the decision of the conference of March 13th, and added: "You will pardon me, if I cannot say anything else more concrete."

In short, Dr. Tiso followed the directives given by the representatives of the Slovak nation: to undertake no obligations, to promise nothing in Berlin. Dr. Tiso concluded his report to the Assembly with the words: "Here, before the Assembly, I place the dry material gathered in Berlin during my visit there, the report which you have just heard, and I beg you to ponder over it and then render a decision!"

Dr. Joseph Tiso made no proposal either for separating from the Czechs or for proclaiming an independent Slovak State. After Tiso completed his report, Dr. Martin Sokol, president of the Slovak Assembly, recessed the session for a few minutes. During the recess, the deputies considered and discussed what they had heard. When the meeting was called to order again at 12:06 P. M., Dr. Sokol said:

"You have heard the manifestation of the President of the Slovak Government, Karol Sidor, and the report of Mr. Deputy Dr. Joseph Tiso about his conversation with Reich Chancellor Adolph Hitler and Reich Minister of Foreign Affairs von Ribbentrop. Now we are supposed to decide by voting whether the Assembly of Slovakia is for an independent Slovak State or not. We shall declare our vote by arising. Those in favor of proclaiming the independence of the Slovak State, please rise!"

It was 12:07 P. M., March 14, 1939, when all 57 members of the Slovak Assembly arose from their seats and, thus, unanimously voted for the establishment of the independent State of Slovakia. Thereupon, Dr. Sokol announced:

"I find that the Assembly of Slovakia, as the only competent organ of the political will of the sovereign Slovak nation, has decided in favor of an independent Slovak State."

Still standing, the deputies sang the Slovak hymn "Hej, Slováci" (Yeah, Ye Slovaks), which later became the National Anthem of the Slovak State.

It was thus that the independence of the Slovak State was proclaimed.

After a thousand years the Slovaks again became masters of their land and their destiny. The hidden yearning of the nation for its own State had come to life. Even here the words of Svetozar Hurban Vajanský are applicable:

"To ascribe characteristics to the masses of people which they do not possess would be folly, indeed. But to rouse and develop the characteristics which the native mass does possess, even though they are hidden, that is our fatal obligation."

This "fatal obligation" was performed by the Slovak Deputies who proclaimed the independence of the Slovak State of March 14, 1939. They had awakened the desire that was hidden in the soul of the nation, brought it out into the open and made it real. And from 1939 to 1945, that hidden desire, translated into reality, grew and prospered in the heart of every self-conscious and loyal Slovak.

No one on this earth shall ever be able to stifle or kill this holy yearning of the Slovak nation for a new and more lasting State of its own — an independent Slovakia.

SLOVAKIA — WINTER WONDERLAND

If you have never been in Slovakia in the winter, you still have something to live for. Under present conditions, when freedom and independence are suppressed by the Communist system, you will not be able to see the "Winter Wonderland" that Slovakia really is, but you might consider visiting the land of the Slovaks at some future time when the plague of Communism has been dispelled.

Winter, in all its sparkling and majestic splendor, presents to every lover of nature the best opportunity of seeing and fully enjoying the natural beauties of Slovakia. The country, because of its mountainous regions, is especially suitable for winter sports, particularly skiing. But you need not be sportsminded to enjoy Slovakia in the winter. The sheer beauty of nature in Slovakia in the winter will enchant you, unburden and refresh your soul, and give added zest for living. You may not want to participate in winter sports in Slovakia, but the happy sight of others enjoying themselves will soothe your tired nerves and give you a satisfaction never before known to you. The Slovak mountains, as I once knew them, are unsurpassed for their winter charm. Accompany me, if you will, on an imaginary trip to them.

Let us start out into the Small Carpathians (**Malé Karpaty**), which extend from the confluence of the Danube and Morava rivers to the Myjava. They divide the Váh plain from the Moravian plain and are covered with leafy and partly evergreen trees and many forest meadows. Their moderate slopes offer good skiing. At the southwestern end, above the village of Devín, there is the Devínska Kobyla, (The Mare of Devín), the peak of which 1719 feet above sea level. Near the city of Modra, there lies the summer resort of Harmónia, open also in winter, with many comfortable hotels with hot and cold running water and good restaurants. In the mountains, about two and one-half miles from Harmónia, on the so-called Sands (**Piesky**) stand two huts: the Zochova hut (1443 feet up), and only three minutes from it is the other one. Near the highest point of the mountain highway leading from Pezinok to Pernek is Országh's hut (1750 feet up) on Baba (Grandmother) near Pezinok.

The best skiing in the Little Carpathians is near Smolenice, where there are plenty of grassy hills and forest meadows.

The White Carpathians (**Biele Karpaty**) stretch from Myjava along the Slovak-Moravian border to the mountain of Makyta, where they meet the Javorníky. They are covered with dense forests; only their wide southern part is less wooded and good for skiing. The most important centre is the Holuby hut (3226 feet) on the Javorina. It is best approached on foot from the railway station of Stará Turá, or from the bus stop Kvetná, on the line Nové Mesto nad Váhom — Uherský Brod. Otherwise you may get to it from the Moravian side by car from Uherský Brod.

Opposite the White Carpathians, on the other side of the Váh valley, are the **Inovec** Mountains, through which passes the railway from Trenčín to Topoľčany. They, too, are densely wooded and have good skiing grounds. Out of the three tourist huts which were here, only the Trenčín Municipal Hut (1500 feet) under Sharp Peak (**Ostrý**

Vrch) at Soblanov remains. The shortest way up is from the station Soblanov following the blue tourist mark, or from Trenčín following the red.

Continuing, the Javorníky, which have huts both on the Slovak and Moravian side, are the Western Beskyds, the southern parts of which are called the *Jeseníky*. Here there are many wooded and bare hills which are wonderful grounds for both the weakest and best skiers. Their location on the borders of Slovakia and Moravia brings them many visitors from both sides. The numerous villages of the Upper Kysuca region offer many possibilities for accommodations both in the hotels as well as in private homes (Makov, Turzovka, Raková, Čadca). The best known centers are: Bumbálka Hut, Makov-Potok Hut and the summer resort Tešínský, which are open in winter. On the road from Veľká Bytča to Makov is Satinka Hut. All these huts are near Makov and the border and have ideal grounds for skiing.

Beyond the Jablunkov Pass, near Čadca, the Beskyds continue on as the **Western Beskyds** and form the border between Slovakia and Poland. Wooded sections mingled with bare ones form ideal skiing terrain, where down-hill runs six miles long are not at all rare. Near the station at Serafinov there is a fine hotel, the surroundings of which are suitable for skiing. From the station in Čadca or Oščadnica, there is a good approach to the hut on Rača (4020 feet). The Bystrická Valley up to Erdúdka and the whole of the Oravská Magura, near Námestovo, is a first class skiing ground with only one drawback. It is hard to approach. Otherwise the Orava region is one of the most popular ski terrains and has good possibilities of approach from the railway Žilina-Košice, and also from the railway Kral'ovany-Suchá Hora.

From the gorge of the Strečno rise the mighty hills of the mountain range called Small Fatra (**Malá Fatra**), which is covered mostly with coniferous trees. Mountain meadows and grassy valleys, as well as the bare peaks of Stoh and Chleb, are the most popular places of northwestern Slovakia. The ideal surroundings of the hut on Chleb (4660 feet) may be approached from the station of Strečno, Šútovo, Kral'ovany and Párnica. The hut there has been repaired and can accommodate 60 persons. It is the starting point for tours on the Fatranský Kriváň, Chleb, Rozsutec and to the valley where Ištvánová lies.

Martinské hole (The Plains of St. Martin) are the southern range of the Little Fatra, extending from the gorge of Strečno southwards to the valley of Zliechov, near Čičmany. Their slopes are mostly wooded, but in the hills are plenty of meadows connected with one another all the way down to the valleys. On the surrounding mountain meadows there is wonderful skiing with long downhill runs and marvelous views of the far surroundings — the High Tatras, the White and Little Carpathians, Beskyds, Radhošť, the Ore mountains and the Inovec and Nitra Mountains. In the Martinské mountains there is a hut 4100 feet above sea level. The best way to approach it is from Turčiansky Svätý Martin along several marked roads.

Opposite the Martinské hole lie the **Great Fatra Mountains**, which have quite a different character. They stretch from the valley of the river Váh to the river Hron; and their northern part is cut by the valley of Lubochňa. The wide ridges of Ostredok, Rakytov and Križná

are suitable for skiing. In the northern part of the Great Fatra, there are ideal grounds for winter sports on the Smrekovica. The best approach to the 4330 foot-high Smrekovica is from the station Podsuchá on the railroad Ružomberok-Korytnica. The unusually high and long lasting snow in the deep coniferous woods attracts thousands of visitors to Smrekovica. Many stay in Ružomberok where there are good accommodations and a tower for ski-jump like on the Smrekovica.

The southern part of the Great Fatra is called Mountains of Kremnica (*Kremnické hory*), where there are plenty of houses for tourists. The center of this region is Kremnica which has several hotels, a tourist night shelter near the station and many private accommodations. It is the starting point for the Skalka hut.

Continuing along the Great Fatra and the Mountains of Kremnica, on the other side of the river Hron, between the railway Zvolen-Levice and Zvolen-Šahy, are the Mountains of Štiavnica (*Štiavnické hory*), with Sitno as their highest peak. This region with its ever-green trees and large meadows, long ridges and slopes, is ideal for winter sports. The center of this region is Banská Štiavnica. The most visited place, however, is the hut of Andrej Kmeť on Sitno (3330 feet up), from where one has a beautiful view as far as the Danube Plain and the High Tatras. Below the Sitno, next to Lake Počúvadlo, are the Kállay sanatorium and the boarding house Anna, which offer good accommodations for guests.

The mountains of Štiavnica have great supplies of ore and are called the Slovak Ore Mountains (*Slovenské rudohorie*). They stretch from the river Hron and the mountains of Štiavnica to Rožňava. The northern part is more or less connected and has several wide hills, from which there run long ridges in the form of rays, between which are deep valleys. The southwestern part is very primitive and has a tourist hut on the Javor (2722 feet), to which the best approach is from the stations Podkriváň, or Pila pod Javorom, on the railway line Zvolen-Lučenec. The hut on Trsti (3722 feet) may be approached from Pila, near Tisovec, or directly from Tisovec.

To the east from Oravská Magura one finds the Stag Mountains (*Roháče*), which have a high mountain character and resemble the Tatras. Skiers visit mostly the Smutná and Látná valleys, as well as the long slopes of Rakoň, Volovec, Úplaz, or go even as far as Osobitá. Snow usually remains until spring and it is nothing unusual to find skiers here even at Easter.

Skiers sometimes go from Roháče to the valleys of Račková or Žiar, which belong to the group of mountains called the Tatras of Liptov (*Liptovské Tatry*), because of their ideal skiing terrain. With their long slopes and mighty peaks they complete the High Tatras to which they really belong.

The longest and widest mountain range in Slovakia are the Low Tatras (*Nízke Tatry*), which extend from the highway Banská Bystrica-Ružomberok to the highway Telgárt-Poprad. North of them flows the river Váh, south the river Hron. Only the lower parts are covered with forests, the rest is bare so that a skier may undertake a one-day tour from Prašivá in the west to Ďumbier and Kráľova hoľa in the east without much fatigue.

The height and breadth of the range affords long descents on both sides from heights of 200—4000 feet up. Not far from Banská Bystrica

is the winter sports center, the Sport hotel Donovaly (3330 feet) with ideal surroundings, woods and meadows. The hotel is first class and is sure to appeal to every guest. From this place there leads a romantic trail to Korytnica, above which rise the mighty ridges of Prašivá and Latiborská Hoľa. At a height of 5460 feet is situated Štefánik's hut beneath the Ďumbier. The highest peaks are Chopok, to which a ski-lift was built (6680 feet) from the valley of Demänová near Liptovský Svätý Mikuláš, and Ďumbier (6820 feet) where snow remains till late spring. From the station Král'ova Lehota there is a highway which crosses the Low Tatra range on its way to Podbrezová. It passes through the villages of Malužiná and Vyšná Boca and reaches the mountain Sport hotel at the lovely hut on Čertovica (4210 feet), which is surrounded by evergreen trees and mountain meadows.

Among the numerous Slovak mountains the High Tatras (**Vysoké Tatry**) are the most visited by lovers of winter sports. It is mostly because of their high mountain altitude, long lasting snow, good accommodations, technical equipment and varied terrain. The starting points to the High Tatras are the railway stations Štrba and Poprad-Tatry on the Košice-Bohumín railway line. From Štrba there runs a good road to the high climatic spa Štrbské Pleso (Tarn of Štrba, 4500 feet) where there are accommodations for 400—500 persons (Hotels Hviezdoslav, Solisko, Kriváň, Móry, boarding houses Jánošík, Marína, Poleka, Iskra and chalets of the Slovak Tourists', and Skiers' Club). Beyond the tarn there are the Furkotská, Mlynická and Mengušovská valleys, to which the skiers come from the ridge of Solisko and Patria. The slope of Solisko is preferred, because there is a ski-lift there for skiers to a height of 6260 feet. In the Mengušov valley under steep Osterva there is a hut at Popradské Pleso (Tarn of Poprad) with accommodations for 150 guests. In late spring and even on summer days it is possible to ski under the Saddle Váhy, near the hut under the Rysy (7600 feet), which is open in summer only.

Another center is Starý Smokovec, where about 1000 persons can be accommodated in hotels and boarding houses (Grand Hotel, Hoepfner, Palace, etc.). Skiing grounds are on the slopes of Slavkov's Peak and in the lovely Studenovodská (Cold Water) valley, or in the Great or Little Cold Valleys. There is a funicular railway running to the Športotel Hrebienok from which goes a toboggan slide and ski run. At the end of the Great Cold Valley there are wonderful skiing grounds near the Zbojnícka hut (6400 feet). In the Little Cold Valley there are two huts: at the beginning of the valley is the hut Zamkovský (5200 feet), and at the upper end lies the Téry hut (6730 feet) on the Five Spiš Lakes. In the surroundings there are lovely skiing grounds for good skiers.

A popular skiing center is Tatranská Lomnica, which is connected with Poprad by both electric and steam railways. It is 3000 feet high, has healthy climate and good skiing places. There are good accommodations in the hotels and boarding houses where 1000—1200 persons may be housed (Grand Hotel Praha, Hotel Lomnica, Ehern, Payer, Spišský dom, Hubertus, Javorina, Božena, etc.). From beyond the Grand Hotel there ran a cable railway to the Lomnický štít (Lomnica Peak, 8780 feet), now running to the station Skalnaté Pleso (Rocky Lake, 5480 feet) only. Above and below the hut there are some of the best skiing places on the Saddle of Lomnica, in the Dead Garden (Mŕtva záhrad-

ka), the slopes of Svišťovka, or the skiing and bob sleigh racing track.

From the nearby Tatranské Matliary we approach huts which also have good skiing grounds in their surroundings. They are as follows: the hut at Šalivový Prameň, the hut at Zelené Pleso (Green Lake) and the hut of Kežmarok, near the Biele plesá (White Lake's); the last one already lies in the Belan Tatra. Not far away from Tatranská Lomnica is situated the village Ždiar, famous for the fine costumes of its peasants. It has bus connections with Tatranská Lomnica, Skiers may find good possibilities on the slopes of the Belan Tatra, near Javorina, or in the well known White Water Valley (Bielovodská dolina).

Beyond the lowlands of Kežmarok there rise the Hills of Levoča (Levočské vrchy), which are not very high but have good conditions for skiing and a hut, the Hut of Levoča under Javorina (4560 feet), best reached from Levoča. In the direction of Prešov there is good skiing on the Branisko (3900 feet).

The Slovak paradise (Slovenský raj) also has its charm of frozen water-falls in winter, but few possibilities for skiing. Only the vicinities of Dobšiná, Krompachy and Gelnica have better terrains. Accommodations are found in the hut at the Ice Caves of Dobšiná.

Eastern Slovakia (Východné Slovensko) has many good grounds, but the possibilities of accommodations are rare because many huts and lodging houses were destroyed. The best skiing near Košice is on Bankov, and at the hut Jahodná (2160 feet), where there are two towers for ski-jumping. The Hills of Slaná are also visited because of their skiing terrains.

Slovakia, endowed by nature with streams and lakes, mountains and valleys, with its modern and ancient structures and quaint villages, is a land of wondrous beauty and charm in all seasons, but in the winter it really is a wonderland.

• • • WHO SAID IT?

"The Slovak people have always shown a willingness to be a part of any federalized state, a readiness to cooperate with the other peoples in it. Their history conclusively proves that a nation can be happy in such an order as long as it enjoys basic freedom. On the other hand, the history of the Slovak people also conclusively demonstrates that, not having this freedom, no nation, even the smallest, will permit itself to be pushed around by even its racial blood-brother, without either openly fighting or (what is worse) planting the seeds of revolt that eventually bring forth some terrible harvest. The conclusion seems evident that the most benevolent and the best-intentioned domination will probably not be accepted by any nation as a substitute for self-rule." — (Congressman Daniel J. Flood, Jan. 7, 1946).

• • •
"Czech public opinion may be excused for not realizing that the situation in Slovakia at the close of 1923 is radically different from that of the first year of the Revolution. And yet the higher bureaucracy tends to act on the assumption that nothing has changed, and ostrich-like to ignore the keen and growing resentment in Slovakia and the urgent need for measures to allay it." — (R. W. Seton Watson: "THE NEW SLOVAKIA," 1924).

Castles of Slovakia

TRENČÍN

Above the city of Trenčín (Trenchen), Slovakia, some 1230 feet above sea level, are spread the picturesque ruins of a former mighty stronghold. Its origin is ancient; they say that the uppermost part was built during the reign of Emperor Marcus Aurelius (about 176 A.D.) by a Roman legionnaire called Terence, hence the name *Terencium* — Trenčín. Terence, it is recorded, was sent into the territory to subjugate the Quadi and Markomani. The latter were conquered at the base of the stony mount on which the ruins can be seen today. An inscription on the rock "*Victoriae Augustorum...*" bears mute testimony to the fact. Many years later Trenčín was taken by various groups, the Huns, the Gepidi, the Avars, and the Magyars. Bretislav, a Czech Prince, raided Trenčín in 1607 and led away many prisoners and cattle into Bohemia. In 1100 the town was devastated by another Czech Prince, Svätopluk.

In the minds of the Slovak people, however, the most illustrious owner of the castle and ruler of Trenčín was Matthew Čák (Tchak) — "Lord of the Váh and the Tatras." After the death of the last Arpad ruler, Andrew III, in 1301, Čák became the adversary of Charles Robert and an ally of the Czech King, Wenceslaus III; the latter died in 1306. For a time Charles Robert was powerless to deal with Matthew Čák who ruled independently over Slovakia. Čák had his own army and coined his own money. In 1312 he was beaten at Rozhanovce near Košice, but Charles Robert could not take the castle where Matthew Čák had retreated.

A peace pact between the Poles, Czechs and Austrians was signed at the stronghold August 24, 1335, in the presence of the Bohemian King, John of Luxemburg, and his son Charles. It was in the Trenčín Castle that Charles, brother of Zigmund, became engaged to Marie, the daughter of Louis the Great and heir to Austria. In 1396 Zigmund gave the castle to General Ctibor, owner of the neighboring castle of Bečkov. When John Ctibor died in 1424, Zigmund gave the Trenčín Castle to his second wife, Barbara Celska.

The Hussite chief, John Jiskra of Brandys took the castle in 1440, expanded and garrisoned it. In 1458 Jiskra surrendered Trenčín, as well as all the other Slovak fortresses in his possession, to King Mathias. The latter married Catherine, the daughter of the Czech George Podebrady, at the Castle May 25, 1461. In 1475 Mathias donated the castle to Stephen Zápolský, whose daughter became the wife of King Zigmund of Poland. Under Zápolský the castle was furnished with costly furniture and some of the finest works of art. Zápolský's son John was chosen King of Hungary in 1526. His adversary Ferdinand of the Habsburg line besieged the place, and General Katzanier actually took it over in 1528 and destroyed it by fire. The castle eventually was rebuilt, but it never became as resplendent as it was during Zápolský's time.

There is a legend connected with the well on the castle grounds — "the lovers' well." According to the legend, Stephen Zápolský, returning from his wars against the Turks, brought a beautiful slave, Fatima, for his wife Hedwig. After a time a Turkish peddler gained

entrance to the castle; it was Omar, the beloved of Fatima. Omar begged Zápolský to free Fatima. Tiring of Omar's pleas, Zápolský remarked: "You cannot draw water from this stone, nor can you draw a tear from my eye." Omar took Zápolský at his word and, with a few of his followers, began to dig for water in the stone. After three years of painful effort, Omar was rewarded; he struck water. Zápolský was moved exceedingly by the deed and granted Omar's request.

Alex Thurzo received the Trenčín stronghold from Ferdinand; his coat of arms marked with the year 1540 can be seen today on a window of the inner castle. Imrich Forgáč, who married the "Black Princess," Prince Wenceslaus' widow, inherited the castle in 1588. But already in 1600 we find the castle the property of the Illeshazys. The Turks tried to gain possession of the castle in 1663, but failed. Rakoczy II was also unsuccessful in his attempt in 1703. In 1742 Queen Marie Therese had the fortress repaired and the tower rebuilt. The latter stands 105 feet high and affords an exquisite view of the vicinity.

There is a legend that the original tower was built by Louis I. When the Rakoczy rebellions were quelled, a plague broke out in Trenčín. People sought refuge in churches, but prayers did not seem to help. People died in their homes and no one buried them. It seemed that death ruled over Trenčín. Then something miraculous took place. The guard on the castle tower saw a very bright light over the tower and then St. Francis Xavier stepped out of a cloud and blessed the people of Trenčín. The guard sounded the alarm, and the whole garrison went out to welcome the Saint. The commander of the garrison made the sign of the cross with his sword and promised that the date of the Saint's appearance would ever be a holy day in Trenčín. The plague passed and Trenčín was saved. The people of Trenčín still observe the memory of that day.

But let me finish the story of the Trenčín Castle. A command had been given that a garrison occupy the castle at all times. Kings and queens passed on, but the order was not revoked until someone thought of it in 1782, when the garrison was called away at last, after occupying the castle for 112 years. Fire destroyed all buildings in 1790.

• • •

RED GEOGRAPHY: The news service of the Central Slovak Catholic Bureau in Rome recently published a story about a certain school inspector of the Trnava district in Slovakia who gave directives to teachers on how to teach. Among other things he said that if nuns were able to interest children in a non-existent being, God," then the teachers certainly should be able to interest children in Stalin who actually exists. "The Marx-Lenin doctrines of our Stalin," he continued, "must be applied in all classes. For example, in geography you teach the children about the East and the West. Now, you could say: The sun rises in the East; there is our great Stalin, the sun of the nations which enlightens all nations with his knowledge. The sun sets in the West; there you find decayed capitalism, the treacherous bourgeoisie and murderous imperialism." — But most of the Slovak teachers and pupils prefer the advice of Horace Greeley: Go West, young man!

The Spirit of THE CONSTITUTION OF THE SLOVAK REPUBLIC

DR. JOHN F. GLEIMAN

In the spring of 1939, when the young Slovak Republic found itself before the difficult task of writing its Constitution, the crisis in Europe, caused by conflicting ideological trends, was nearing its climax. Democratic liberalism, after a fruitful existence of 150 years in Europe, was being attacked from all sides, not only by the totalitarian currents of Communism, Fascism and Nazism, but also by other philosophical, religious, economical and political systems. In that apocalyptic confusion of ideologies, the Committee appointed by the Assembly of the Slovak Republic labored on the draft of the Constitution Document. While it was thus occupied, national aggressions from the East, South, West and North, appeared ominously on the horizon, threatening with destruction the healthy offshoot of the life of the Slovak State.

Even if the environment of that ideological ferment and frightful international situation effected peoples deeply, the work of the Constitution Committee — despite its compromising tenor — is, nevertheless, a clear reflection of the unity of thought and sentiment of the Slovak people. In oppressed peoples there naturally develops not only a feeling of solidarity, but also a profound religious life. Actually, the most significant trait of Slovak tradition is the Christian world-outlook of the nation; that is true of both the Catholic majority and the Lutheran minority of the Slovak nation. But the tradition of democratic freedoms also remained very much alive. Along with Christian tradition, these ideas, too, were the moving forces of Slovak politics since the thirties of the past century. Christian tradition and the idea of democratic freedoms were the defensive bulwark, by which the currents of totalitarian ideologies were repulsed and which to a certain extent unified political thinking in Slovakia.

Only thus could it happen that, in the midst of aggressive totalitarian ideologies, which definitely did suppress the principles of democratic liberalism, the Constitutional Law No. 185 of 1939 was approved by the Assembly of the Slovak Republic. This law adopted practically the whole system of democratic-liberalistic Constitutions of the 18th and 19th centuries. Only thus could it happen that Slovakia — wedged in from the right and the left between Godless bolshevism and anti-Christian neo-paganism — brought forth a Constitution saturated with the Christian spirit and especially with the principles of the social encyclicals of the Holy See.

LIBERALISTIC—DEMOCRATIC ELEMENTS

The Constitution of the United States of America from 1788 and the Constitution of the French Revolution became the models of the democratic-liberalistic constitutions of the 19th century European States. They were the first to incorporate into constitutional norms the principles of the great thinkers of modern democracy — Locke, Montesquieu and Rousseau: the right of determination of the majority of the people, the idea of equality before the law and the guarantees of individual freedoms. These, in time, became the great documents of human rights.

The Constitution of the Slovak Republic contains all the fundamental principles of these models. The constitutional intention to organize a State on the tested principles of democratic freedoms is documented by the very name of the State itself: "The Slovak Republic." At a time when dictators were in power in the surrounding totalitarian States, the Slovak Constitution consistently validates the democratic principle of the right of determination of the majority in the election of the president of the Republic and the deputies of parliament, in the decisions of parliament, the State Council, the Government and self-administrating bodies. At a time when the USSR culminated the liquidation of its so-called bourgeois class, which was outlawed, and in Germany the Nuremberg anti-Semitic laws were completing their work, the Slovak Assembly did not hesitate to accept a Constitution founded on the idea of equality of all citizens without regard to origin, nationality and religion. And just so, at a time when executive power of government of the totalitarian super-States had attained complete preponderance in the management of the State, the Slovak Constitution codified without reservations a system outlined by Locke and culminated by Montesquieu, a system of legal and free government, depending on the division of State power into the legislative, executive and judicial branches.

The central legislative power received its construction according to the principles of Locke. Its bearer became the Assembly of the Slovak Republic. That central power in the State the Constitution executed also with the rest of the postulates of liberal-democratic constitutions: with immunity and incompatibility of the members of the legislature (Assembly), elected in general, direct, free and secret elections and with the competency of electing a president, establishing a budget and military duty, of permitting taxes and accepting international agreements.

According to the principles of Montesquieu, the Constitution subordinated executive power to legislative power and codified the responsibility of the president and the government to parliament. It regulated the activity of the President, the Government and the State Council according to tested republican models. It followed democratic principles also by acknowledging the direct participation of the citizenry in the State management through the self-administrations of regions and professions. The immortal principle of Montesquieu regarding the independence of the judiciary also was fully validated in the Constitution. Complete separation of the judiciary from the executive power, as well as the principle that no one shall be deprived of his own lawful judge, was also established by law. The independence of the judges was safeguarded by the codification of the principle of non-transferability of judges and their incompatibility with other paid functions, as well as by expressing the principle that a judge is bound only by law and has the right to explore the validity of governmental regulations and whether laws were properly proclaimed.

The Constitution did not lack the customary safeguards of freedom. Paragraph 81 said:

"All inhabitants, regardless of their origin, nationality, religion and calling, enjoy the protection of life, freedom and property." Besides this general principle, it guaranteed special principles, such as: personal freedom, domestic peace, secrecy of the mails, the right of

assembly and organization, freedom of the press and expression of opinions, freedom of religion, scientific research and arts, and the right of the nationalities to use their own language in public life and in the schools. Finally, with the sentence — "No one shall be punished for conduct which does not violate the legal penal norm and for which the penalty was not beforehand defined by law or legal norm" — it adopted the classical principle of the freedom of man "nulla poena, nullum crimen sine lege," which is the foundation of legal order in a lawful State.

CHRISTIAN—DEMOCRATIC ELEMENTS

When the shady sides of liberalistic capitalism unfettered the social struggles, the ideology of Marxism about permanent class warfare arose and spread. Proclaiming the inevitability of world revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat, the elimination of the bourgeois class, the abolition of private ownership, and collective economy of communities, this ideology threatened the entire structure of Christian civilization with destruction. That is why already in the second half of the past century Christian thinkers, especially the Catholic Bishops Ketteler and Mermillod, as well as Protestant pastor Constantine Frantz, sought possibilities of mitigating social opposites and then by un-proletariatizing the proletariat to destroy class differences completely. In the main, the papal encyclicals, beginning with *RERUM NOVARUM* (1890), through *QUADRAGESIMO ANNO* (1931), all the way to *MYSTICI CORPORIS* (1943), created a system, which — by the principle of personalism, with emphasis on the social function of the family and with the building of autonomous professional organizations, — wants to solve acute social problems, restrict the stifling interference of over-dimensioned State power into every section of society and private life, and, thus, rescue Christian society.

It is natural that the Slovak Republic, being overwhelmingly Catholic, attempted to experiment with this system and incorporated at least some of its principles into its own Constitution. Thus it was that regulations arose which protected especially the family, and in the spirit of these principles also the worker, his work and wages, whereby strikes — as something outlived of the era of class warfare — were forbidden. In the spirit of the encyclicals, the Constitution defined the obligations of citizens — which are both spiritual and physical work — to fulfill the tasks of their calling, to help public organs perform the functions required by law and the authorities and, finally, the obligatory care of the parents for the education and training of their children.

The regulation in paragraph 79 — "Ownership has a social function and binds the owner to deal with it in the interest of the general welfare" — is the basis of the encyclical *QUADRAGESIMO ANNO* and the social writings of Pope Pius XII. The most penetrating social reform, which the Constitution took over from the encyclical *QUADRAGESIMO ANNO*, was the framework institution of self-administered States, placing according to their calling all citizens without exception into six professions or states: agriculture, industry, trade-commerce, banking, the free professions, and public employees.

The Munich Pact of Great Britain and France with Germany and Italy in September, 1938, factually surrendered Central Europe to

the power of Hitler and Mussolini. No one knew at that time just when the furies of war would be unleashed and what fate would befall Slovakia. In that hopeless situation, all the Slovak civic parties united with the Hlinka Slovak Peoples' Party to form the Party of National Unity in October, 1938. Historical objectivity tells us to state that this hardly would have happened if it were not for stifling pressure from all sides. The Constitution codified this Party as the only representative of the political will of the Slovak nation. This fact undoubtedly shows sharply the helpless determination of a small nation, which in its fatal danger was forced to make this compromise with the gigantic aggressor, when his steel columns ominously waited on its borders. Despite this fact, however, the Constitution did not accept the totalitarian principle of one party, because it allowed separate parties for the nationalities.

In later years, under the pressure of the totalitarian super-States and the war, this Constitution could not validate itself without particular hindrances, but from the perspective of the first decade, the Slovak Constitutional Document itself in its entirety actually appears to us as a work of principles, the principles of democratic freedoms and the principles of Christian democracy. It was the collective work of the spirit of the Slovak nation that formed the State. And as such, it will pass on into history.

• • •

WHO SAID IT?

THE CZECHOSLOVAK WAY. — "Dr. Beneš, the Czechoslovak President, must be a thorn in the flesh of those who contend that Russia will deal only with puppets in neighboring countries of Eastern Europe. Beneš is no puppet. He is no Communist. His political philosophy is based on the liberal democracy of the West. Yet no one is surprised because his good friend, Stalin, has just concluded a new agreement with him, providing for entry of the Czechoslovak administration in Dr. Beneš' homeland in the wake of the Red Army at the earliest possible time. That is exactly what we'd expect, for relations between Dr. Beneš' government and that of the Soviet Union are a long-standing model of cordiality.

"The fact, of course, is that Dr. Beneš is a first-rate statesman, one of the best in the world. As such, he knows that a bright future for his country is out of the question unless it has the good will of the USSR. He and his countrymen also remember that Russia did not desert them in the black era of Munich. Today he has Czechoslovakia with him in the 20-year mutual assistance treaty with Russia.

"The consequence is that Russia respects the independence of its good neighbor. Dr. Beneš, accordingly, is free not only to plan confidently for the future of his own land but to serve Europe and all the United Nations as an outstanding leader for collective security. That is the Beneš way, the Czechoslovak way, based upon the principles of independence and interdependence. It should be studied as an example by the leaders of all countries in Eastern Europe — and by American friends of those countries." — (THE CHICAGO SUN, 1944).

THE STORY OF THE TWO "KRNO"

DR. IVAN KRNO (KERNO), who retired as United Nations assistant secretary-general for legal affairs on September 10, does not want to go home to Czecho-Slovakia. He will seek asylum here. Krno said as much September 29 on the "United or Not" television program. Now 61, Krno was a member of the "CZECH" (the papers had it, and how right they were!) diplomatic service since 1918 and also served as aide to Dr. Edward Beneš, who resigned the presidency and fled his country in 1938 and then returned behind Soviet bayonets in 1945 to become president again by the grace of Stalin. Krno, born a SLOVAK, chose to betray his own people and serve the Beneš Czechs — the Czech Socialists. It paid him well. And Beneš and his followers could always point to Krno and say: See, Slovaks also have representation. Just as they always did with Hodža, Lettrich, Osuský, Papánek, Slávik, Gejza Krno and others. It was good window dressing. Patriotic Slovaks, however, regarded them as traitors and renegades. They still do. And one can hardly blame them, because these so-called "Czechoslovaks" actually worked and are still working for the destruction of the national existence of the nation they are descended from.

Krno is one of the new breed of men created by the United Nations — an "international civil servant." Interviewed on TV, Krno explained that the fate of his country (Czecho-Slovakia) proved in 1948 that "you can make no deals with dictators." When asked why it took him so long (over four years!) to utter the obvious, Dr. Krno was rather embarrassed for a moment and then blurted: "I had to conform with UN staff regulations and to reserve my opinion." What a confession for a UN assistant secretary-general to make! He was fully convinced, as he said, that "you can make no deals with dictators," and yet he kept on trying to do just that! Boy, call Senator McCarran! Not only to question Dr. Ivan Krno, but his pals as well — the other "Czechoslovaks" (Beneš Socialists), who did not do badly as members and followers of the NATIONAL FRONT government in Czecho-Slovakia after 1945 — and who are not doing badly at all even now as heralded "democratic, anti-communist" refugees in the USA. But there is a story about another "Czechoslovak" Krno.

GEJZA L. KRNO, Gottwald's former general-consul in Chicago, Ill., gave vent to his "democratic" feelings at a meeting in Chicago on August 27, 1952. Present were 107 Czechs and 4 Slovaks. At this meeting, Dr. Joseph Černý, former Czecho-Slovak minister for the Czech Agrarian Party, had the gumption to renounce the fiction of the "Czechoslovak" nation, ethnically speaking, and stand up for the inherent right of the Slovak nation to its own existence and to decide freely its own destiny. "The Slovak nation shall decide its future independently and its decision will bind every judicious person," Dr. Černý said.

Krno did not agree with Černý and, to the surprise of 99 per cent of those present, exploded: "We Slovaks, who stand behind the Czechoslovak Republic, Mr. Minister, cannot agree with your principles; and we are of the opinion that even if 90 per cent of the Slovaks would not want the Czechoslovak Republic, then we would have to create such a situation which would force it upon them, just as we did

in 1944 at the time of the Slovak rebellion. Therefore, the Council (of Free Czechoslovakia) should plan its home coming in such a way so that it would have its own military force, occupy Slovakia and dominate public opinion, and then we need not fear violence or shooting. Why, even in America the South fought against the North and, therefore, why should 1944 not be repeated once more in Slovakia?"

Quite a mouthful of "democracy" from a member of the "Council of Free Czechoslovakia" who once served as Gottwald's representative in Chicago and now enjoys "political" asylum in the good old USA as a "democratic, anti-Communist" refugee! "WE SLOVAKS," said Krno, as if he had any right to speak for them, "we Slovaks" would force Czechoslovakia upon 90 per cent of the Slovaks against their will! And that, ladies and gentlemen, defines quite accurately a "Czechoslovak" and a "Beneš Czech". Gejza L. Krno is a model "Czechoslovak" and a loyal "Beneš Czech" all in one package. Any wonder, then, that over 90 per cent of the Slovaks are opposed to him or his kind? But there is more to the story.

One of those present at that meeting noted what had taken place. The whole account was then given to Dr. Michael Zibrin, former member of the Prague Parliament, who wrote about the incident in the "JEDNOTA" — the most widely read Slovak paper in the USA — on September 10. Dr. Zibrin's reactions to Krno's statement follow:

"If this were the opinion of Krno himself, it would suffice just to make a note of it. It would be a waste of time to debate much about his nonsense. But Krno spoke in Chicago, where he once was the exponent of communist Prague and where, since that time, his residence serves as the meeting place when any one from the "Council of Free Czechoslovakia" comes to Chicago to see certain 'Slovak men or Slovak women.' Krno is a willing and genial host. He is generally regarded as the mouthpiece of Dr. Joseph Lettrich and likes to boast of the promises and assurances for the future made to him by the political twins Lettrich-Zenkl.

"After this clarification, of course, we must look into the statement made by Krno, because to us it is abundantly clear that Krno's mouth expressed the thoughts which were given expression at the conferences of Lettrich, Zenkl, Ferienčík and other men of power from the Council of Free Czechoslovakia. Furthermore, it is well known to us that at similar conferences, when those present did not speak and plan so undiplomatically, the matter was reported generally in such a way that there would be some kind of election under an American occupation, and when the Americans assure liberation, then the Slovaks out of gratitude will accept the American concept, which is, they say, that of Lettrich and Zenkl. This bitter pill, coated so nicely, made every one smile and shake their heads. No one wanted to believe that Americans at some future time would want to violate the free will of a nation. Such a thing is not in the American nature and does not conform with American democracy.

"But Krno revealed even more when he blasted at Dr. Černý. He told us, in fact, that the members of the Council of Free Czechoslovakia are reckoning with a 90 per cent majority of the Slovak nation which is for an independent solution excluding any conception of Czechoslovak statehood. We know that such reports have come from Slovakia even to Lettrich and Slávik. We could even name the

persons who brought those reports, but we do not want any one investigated or tortured a second or even a third time, as it happened to martyr Johnny Hvasta.

"Krno also revealed that his companions and his political representatives are not willing to respect even a 90 per cent majority, but are planning to resort to the drastic and brutal methods, which prevailed in Slovakia during and after the 'rebellion' of 1944, and for which, in several instances, the political representatives of Krno were responsible in the judgment of the nation. Slovak emigrants should take note of this and call it to the attention of American-Slovak societies, which, in turn, should call it to the attention of their own political representatives so they could know and see what kind of democracy is planned in the heart of Central Europe for American money.

When our nation at home learns about it, the loud speakers of Radio Free Europe will not be able to outshout Krno's words, and wasted are the millions put into various "freedom" movements and institutions, because their work, carried on by such people and influenced by their thoughts, helps Communism more than it harms it."

This, then, is the story of the two Krnos, who judased the holy cause of their own nation for a career. They are not sorry for the part they played in the exploitation and enslavement of the Slovak people. If they are, they have not given expression to any sorrow in any visible manner. Of course, if they were sorry, they would not be associated today with the enemies of Slovak freedom and independence, the Beneš Czechs. Gejza Krno and other Slovaks in the services of the Beneš Czechs believe that Zenkl-Ripka-Lettrich still hold a "promise" of important functions, if and when the Communists are ousted from power in Czecho-Slovakia. They believe that American policy is in reality the policy of Zenkl and Lettrich, i.e. of the "Council of Free Czechoslovakia," and they have reason for that belief. They ask: Who gets to work in the VOICE OF AMERICA, RADIO FREE EUROPE and other governmental and semi-governmental institutions? And answer: Only the Beneš Czechs, the followers of Zenkl and Lettrich. Want to get in on American dollars? now and, later, to the pork barrel of Prague and Bratislava? If you do, get in and pitch for the Beneš Czechs! Remember UNRRA? Being a man of principle and a stubborn Slovak gets you nothing, but being a Beneš Czech gets you everything! That is the magic Zenkl and Lettrich are using today on all Czech and Slovak refugees to get them in line with the Beneš Czechs.

Gejza Krno's argument is understandable. Zenkl and Lettrich have a simple plan. Czecho-Slovakia was given to the Czechs on a platter in 1918; after it collapsed in 1939, when no one, not even the Czechs rallied to save it, it was recreated in 1945 and handed over to Beneš and his followers. After three short years of the National Front Government, in which they were the majority, the Beneš Czechs delivered Czecho-Slovakia, lock, stock and barrel, to Gottwald and other stooges of the Kremlin. The transaction took place smoothly, without any apparent physical resistance. Now, it's up to Americans again to do their part: liberate Czecho-Slovakia from the Gottwaldmen and again hand it over to the Beneš Czechs. Krno has the word of Zenkl and Lettrich that the plan cannot miss, because

Zenkl and Lettrich have the inside track in the U. S. State Department.

Well, there is evidence aplenty that the Beneš Czechs got away with murder, but we do not want to believe that their "simple plan" will work. There are a lot of gullible people in America, and some peculiar Americans in the State Department, but we honestly believe that the Beneš Czechs shall not prevail this time. Americans of Slovak descent will continue to demand the ouster of all un-American, anti-Slovak, anti-democratic and pro-Soviet elements from all official and semi-official agencies of government — and that includes the Beneš Czechs, the so-called "Czechoslovaks," represented among others by Zenkl, Lettrich, Ripka, Slávik and the two Krnos. American principles must not be surrendered for the political advantage of foreigners who are in a large measure responsible for the Red enslavement of their own nations. The blood of hundreds of thousands of our honored dead cries out against them. America stands for the liberation of ALL nations, including and not excluding the SLOVAK nation. The Slovak nation has an inherent right to freedom and independence, anything that Zenkl, Lettrich and Gejza Krno might have to say to the contrary notwithstanding!

• • •

WHO SAID IT?

"I do not believe there is any danger that Russia will swallow up Czechoslovakia, as some people think. In fact, almost a year ago Russia and the Government of Czechoslovakia signed, in Moscow, a treaty which can best be described as a treaty of friendship and respect. In it, Czechoslovakia is guaranteed freedom and independence. It remains a sovereign state, and the two countries bind themselves to respect each other's rights in every field. I believe that the Russo-Czechoslovak Treaty of December, 1943, should be the model of all treaties between all the peoples of Europe. I have no fears about Russia, but I think that Russia is entitled to have her close neighbors friendly. None must ever be a pawn on the chessboard of Europe again. Fortunately, Czechoslovakia has always been friendly toward Russia, and I am sure that in the future Czechoslovakia will maintain that friendship and her own freedom and independence." — Edward O. Tabor, a Beneš Czech, WWSW, Pittsburgh, Pa., 10-26-44).

• • •

"To nations in Czecho-Slovakia the Americans are selling democracy through so-called CZECHOSLOVAKS. They are the Czech imperialists who have been the bane of all the nations in Czecho-Slovakia since 1918. To whom do these gentlemen, the Zenkls and Peroutkas, wish to speak? To the Slovaks who, apart from a handful of Quislings, do not wish to have anything to do with Czecho-Slovakia and Czech domination? Not only nationalist Slovaks, but also Slovakian communists wish to be rid of Prague. Of five Slovakian communist leaders in 1945, four are today in prison and expecting trial for national deviations. Does Mr. Peroutka, with his lavishly paid crew, wish to speak to Hungarians who were forcibly incorporated into Czecho-Slovakia in 1919? If not, then to whom? To Czechs? Then he should speak as a Czech and not as a Czechoslovak." — (The Czech "PRAVDA" — London — June 1951).

THE PURGE IN PRAGUE

JOSEPH A. MIKUŠ

Two very prominent Communist personalities were executed recently in Prague: Karel Slansky, former Secretary General of the Czech Communist Party, and Vladimir Clementis, former Foreign Minister of Czecho-Slovakia.

To Central-European observers probably the greatest surprise of the Prague purge trial was the fact that two different "deviationisms" were tried and convicted by the same court at one and the same time: the "Zionism" of the Jewish group, headed by Slansky, and the "Slovak nationalism" of Clementis. This may appear as the same kind of crime from an external and purely legalistic view of Communist "justice," but politically there is a clear distinction between the two "deviationisms."

Three years ago Slansky and Clementis were regarded as antagonistic personalities in the Communist Party of Czecho-Slovakia. At that time Slansky was an important leader of "proletarian internationalism," the accepted Communist concept of international collaboration. For a long time he was considered as "a man of Moscow." But being an intellectual, he was obsessed with the very dangerous ambition of trying to overshadow "the man from the people," Mr. Gottwald. Slansky was, therefore, the victim of a personal rivalry with Gottwald in their struggle for power. As Secretary General of the Czech Communist Party, Slansky thought he could play the role of Stalin in Czecho-Slovakia, while for Gottwald it would be sufficient to play the role of Shvernik. Now, at the trial, this rivalry had to be considered and expressed in terms of criminal law. Since the Soviet Union had to change its attitude toward Israel, considering the Arab world of more importance on the political chessboard, it was easy to construct the crime of Slansky as a collusion with a foreign power against the interests of the Czecho-Slovak State.

The story of Clementis is a different one. In the eyes of Moscow, his Communist record since 1939 was not good; it did not conform with Stalinist policy. At that time, you will recall, he expressed himself against the Ribbentrop-Molotov Pact. At the end of World War II, even though he was a member of the Benes Government in London, Clementis preferred not to return to Prague via Moscow. And Moscow remembered. So did Gottwald. Molotov was cool toward Clementis at the Peace Conference in Paris in 1946. During a diplomatic reception, Mr. Molotov went first to exchange greetings with Mr. Hajdu, then only a member of the Czecho-Slovak delegation, and only then approached Mr. Clementis, the Under-Secretary of State and Acting Chief of the delegation.

After the death of Jan Masaryk, Clementis became Minister of Foreign Affairs. Mr. Slansky, Secretary General of the Communist Party, together with three Under-Secretaries in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs — Vavro Hajdu, Arthur London and Friedrich Geminde — conspired against him. While attending the UNO General Assembly sessions in New York, in 1949, as Chief of the Czecho-Slovak

delegation, Clementis lost control of his Ministry at home. Under the direction of William Siroky, then Vice-Premier, Hajdu, London and Geminder took over the controls of the Foreign Affairs Ministry and from that time on Mr. Clementis became their potential captive.

In November, 1949, rumors began to circulate in the world press that Mr. Clementis was not disposed to return to Czecho-Slovakia any more. But then Mr. Gottwald sent Mrs. Clementis by plane to New York to convince her husband that everything was in order and he could fully depend on the President's trust and protection.

Mr. Clementis gave in to the pleadings of his wife and returned to Prague about the middle of December, 1949. There he was greeted at the former Wilson Station by Mr. Siroky and the conspiring Under-Secretaries. Four months later, on March 14, 1950, Clementis was obliged to resign his office "voluntarily" and a year later, in February 1951, he was incarcerated.

As far as internal politics is concerned, Mr. Clementis was partisan to a federative reform in Czecho-Slovakia and stood for certain national liberties in his native Slovakia. Clementis, therefore became a victim both of the "Stalinism" of Moscow and the centralism of Prague.

The next purge trial is supposed to take place in a short time in Bratislava, capital of Slovakia, against a group of "Titoist" deviationists, among whom we may find: **Gustav Husak**, former Chief of the autonomous Government of Slovakia, **Karol Schmidke**, former president of the autonomous Parliament in Bratislava, **Ladislav Novomesky**, former Minister of Education in the Slovak autonomous Government, **Daniel Okaly**, brother-in-law of Clementis and former Minister of Interior in Slovakia, **Ivan Horvat**, former Minister Plenipotentiary in Budapest, and others.

• • •

WHO SAID IT?

"The Czech People's Party regards the transfer of Germans as a historical success, indeed, which with its significance falls in line immediatly next to the successful conclusion of the treaty with the USSR. . . . For this success we are obligated to Šrámek's government with great gratitude. . . . We were interested in getting rid of the Germans as speedily as possible. Allow me on this occasion to mention a politician, who alongside of President Beneš and Monsignor Šrámek had a significant share in this plan of transfer. It was Mr. Minister Dr. Ripka (applause). Since the Autumn of 1938 I have been his intimate fellow-worker. . . . Ripka worked on the transfer of Germans, because he regarded the war that had erupted at that time as a really historical opportunity to clean our land of burdensome German ballast. . . . All the groups of the National Front at the end of 1943 even fully agreed with this line and, therefore, the transfer of the Germans is also the result of the joint effort of all the groups and parties of the National Front. We shall exclude no one from this success even though it is true that, e.g., the Communist Party in 1939—1941 did not have so unanimous and so uncompromisingly Slovanic a conception of the matter as it has today." — (Dr. Ivo Ducháček in the Prague Provisional National Assembly, March 8, 1946. He is now supposed to be the "big wheel" in the Czechoslovak Division of the VOICE OF AMERICA).

THEY WANTED TO BE FREE

Enemies of Slovak independence and their servants claim that the proclamation of Slovak independence in 1939 was exclusively the work of the Nazis, and the Slovaks, they say, did not want to be independent.

At the end of May, 1952, there was published in Paris the diary of Count John Szembek, who for many years was a State Secretary in the Polish Ministry of Foreign Affairs. In his function as Vice-Minister of Foreign Affairs he had the possibility of following at close range Polish Foreign policy and to a certain extent even influence it. His "Diary," therefore, is an unusually valuable and worthy documentary work for European politics and diplomatic history, as is emphasized in the introduction of the book by Léon Noel, the former French ambassador to Warsaw.

For the Slovaks, this book contains unusually valuable notes for assessing Polish-Slovak relationships, especially those of 1938-1939. Perhaps one of the most interesting is the entry about the conversation with Minister Karol Sidor. It is one of the longest of his notes, even though the book deals almost exclusively with records of meetings with presidents, ministers, ambassadors and other outstanding public figures. The following passage, taken from Szembek's "Diary," refers to Sidor's visits.

"OCTOBER 19, 1938"

CONVERSATION WITH SIDOR

"Today this Slovak representative paid me a courtesy call. I assured him that we entertain the greatest sympathies for all the desires of the Slovak nation; I expressed the hope that his country would find a way of coming to some agreement with the Magyars, and I assured him that we are advising Budapest to proceed with moderation when formulating territorial demands to the address of the Slovaks."

Furthermore, Szembek notes: "During the dinner which I gave in honor of Sidor, and in which Arciszewski and Kobylanski participated, my guest described the situation in Slovakia. He told us that his countrymen are endeavoring to proclaim a completely independent Slovak State, which, however, politically, militarily, as well as from the cultural standpoint would depend on Poland and economically on Germany and Hungary. The Slovaks did not want to let in German and Magyar cultural influences, but wished to place their country under some kind of political and military protection of Poland. This pro-Polish orientation is supported by the entire Slovak nation. The nation, however, is stunned — as he expressed it — by the question of Polish demands regarding Spiš and Orava. This time Sidor spoke very cryfully. I answered that if we were going to be concerned with and independent Slovak State, this question would no longer present any difficulties, because we would not present any territorial demands to independent Slovakia and that our demands for the adjustment of the border could not be regarded as unconditionally necessary for the

normal development of relations between Poland and Slovakia. The situation apparently would be different, if we had to present this problem to the Czechoslovak State."

In another part of the report, we read: "I gave Sidor an audience on October 20th. I asked him what instructions he had gotten from his own Government when he was leaving for Warsaw and what was the actual purpose of his trip. He answered that the Slovak Government authorized him to declare in Warsaw what Msgr. Tiso, as well as Papée (the Polish ambassador in Prague), had already told us earlier, namely that the aim of his country is the creation of an independent Slovak State. I asked him to explain to me what now was the stand of the Slovak Government in regards to Prague. Sidor replied that his country at present still forms a part of the Czechoslovak Republic and that Slovak ministers were members of the Czechoslovak Government, even though they do not actually take part in its negotiations. Thus far only one minister participated in two sessions of the Government. As far as questions of foreign affairs are concerned, the Slovaks are pursuing their own policy, and their emissaries, who just a short time ago went to European capitals, were sent there by the president of the Slovak Government, Tiso, and not by Prague.

"I then asked Sidor the question what kind of methods his countrymen intended to use to gain complete independence. According to him (Sidor), Tiso intends to attain his goal by legal means. It emanates from the following principle: in the present situation, as a result of the chaos which reigns in the Republic, and especially because one half million men of the Czech Army is garrisoned in Slovakia, which does not have an independent army and whose Slovak soldiers are on the Czech borders (which presents a serious impediment to the definite separation of Slovakia from Czechia, as Sidor underscored so emphatically), it was not possible to think of using more radical methods. Sidor personally would be willing to use them and thinks that it might be useful to use what is called the 'Hlinka Guard' and the National Committees, which he directs. But in a spirit of loyalty, he obeys the Slovak Government.

"Such is the political program of Tiso, endeavoring to adhere to legal methods: the election of a new president of the Czechoslovak Republic is supposed to take place not later than October 28. The Slovaks are going to demand the election of a Catholic, who would guarantee a separation from Francophile and Sovietophile orientation in Foreign policy. Chvalkovský is a candidate, and Hlinka's Party is going to vote for him. This presidency, however, is going to have only a temporary character and will end with a new adjustment of the Constitution. The new Constitution will create a federation, thanks to which Slovakia will attain its own parliament and a broad autonomy. From that moment on the Slovaks will negotiate with Prague regarding their demands. Sidor is certain that the Czechs will never be able to fill them. The Slovak Parliament will then definitely proclaim the separation of Slovakia from Czechia, as once happened in the case of Sweden and Norway. Sidor thinks that it will be necessary to wait two months before that point is reached. In the meantime, the Slovak Government will complete its work of decentralization and organize its own police, gendarmery and

army, which it already began to do. Internal administration already now is in a large measure in Slovak hands. As far as finances are concerned, the Slovaks are taking over all State properties on their territory. Tax incomes are already flowing into Bratislava. The State Bank is already in the process of organization."

So much for the Diary of the Polish Vice-Minister about his conversation with Minister K. Sidor on October 20, 1938, therefore 14 days after the proclamation of Slovak autonomy in Žilina and almost five months before the proclamation of the independence of Slovakia on March 14, 1939.

This report proves that the Slovaks wanted to be independent long before Hitler offered to protect their independence. Furthermore, the Slovaks rejected unilateral German preponderance over the territory of Slovakia and would have preferred to replace it with a political and military protection of Poland, cooperating only economically with the Germans and Magyars.

Sidor was for Slovak independence. The development tended, emphasized by the intention of Tiso's Government, toward complete Slovak independence.

Looking at it from a historical perspective, German intervention in March, 1939, greatly harmed Slovak efforts for independence in substance. That is it cast a shadow of German intervention on the actuality of the proclamation of Slovak independence, which hurt Slovak aspirations then and is damaging to them even today. Slovak development tended toward the ideal of Slovak independence. It is necessary to admit that, in the main and above all else, it was the fault of Czech imperialists, who unseated the legal government of Tiso with a military putsch on March 9, 1939, and again installed Czech hegemony over Slovakia, which all served as a pretext for Hitler to intervene into the development of the relationship of the Slovaks to the Czechs.

Szembek's "Diary" also clearly shows that Czech imperialists drove the Slovaks into cooperation with the national-socialistic Germany of Adolph Hitler. Their treatment of Slovak problems only hurried the day of Slovak independence. (JAS).

• • •

WHO SAID IT?: — "In negotiating the treaty we have just signed, I did not betray my country to Russia. The Czechoslovaks are very bad deceivers. We intend to live our own life in our own way, and we know that Russia will respect our way of living... And so, my friends, you and we are going to continue our policy of collaboration, friendship, confidence in, and good faith towards Soviet Russia. I am never going to undertake anything and neither are you, which could be in any way against the interest of this vitally necessary collaboration. There are still people left who are afraid of this collaboration. So far, Soviet Russia more than proved herself at Stalin-grad, at Sevastapol, and on the Don. . . . I know the Russian way of living; I believe in it; and I admire it. We have a great deal in common with Soviet Russia. . . . So, with you, I hail Soviet Russia as a great and essentially necessary factor in the present and future fortunes of Europe." — (Jan Masaryk, Hotel Commodore, New York City, December 21, 1943).

THE SLOVAK ASSEMBLY AND GOVERNMENT

It is very interesting to follow the developement of the Slovak national idea from the oldest times to the present. As one of the oldest expressions of Slovak nationalism, made in writing, we must regard the foreword to the Catholic hymnal "*Canthus Catholici*," published in 1655, in which the author, the learned Jesuit Szölösi, with words of wonderment and love, calls the attention of his readers to the first Slovak State, to Svätopluk and to Saints Cyril and Methodius.

And since Szölösi's time, Slovak patriots have frequently returned to this theme: Magin in 1728; George Papánek in 1780, in his history of Slovak rulers; George Sklenár in 1784, in his history of Great Moravia; in the "*Staré Noviny*" (Old News) in 1786. The period 1787-1792 is climaxed with the publication of the first Slovak Grammar, the organization of the "Learned Guild" (Učené tovarišstvo), and the publication of Fándly's book, in which the author speaks warmly to the Slovaks and calls their attention to the first Slovak State. In 1793 Fándly again publishes the history of Great Moravia, and in 1833 John Hollý publishes his famed epic "*Svätopluk*." This period, lasting over 130 years, is marked in learned books with a constant return to the theme of the first Slovak State.

At the end of this epoch, three years after Hollý's "*Svätopluk*" was published, on the Devín ramparts the young friends of Louis Štúr spoke from the ruins of Svätopluk's stronghold, repeating everything that had to that time appeared only in books. This is the border line. With the book of a young follower of Štúr, Benjamin Pravoslav Červenák, titled "*Zrcadlo Slovenska*" (Mirror of Slovakia), which Hurban published in 1844, ends this epoch of returning to the past without a single chapter about what we want in the present and the future. We could say, then, that Slovak patriots kept the flames of their nationalism burning for 150 years by returning to the past. However, they did not state clearly just how they pictured Slovak life of the future.

In 1845, when Štúr began publishing the first Slovak political newspaper, a change was gradually taking place in the thinking of the people. Slovaks began to talk about what should be done to preserve the Slovak nation, to increase its spiritual and material welfare. They talked about concrete Slovak demands. In 1842, Dr. Paul Jozeffy placed a petition before the emperor, requesting that the Slovak language be the medium of teaching in Slovakia, of preaching in the churches, and that church records (vital statistics) be kept in Slovak. Jozeffy's demands concerned only the linguistic question.

But in 1848, the Slovaks went much farther. They proclaimed themselves independent from the Magyars. Michael Milan Hodža, Louis Štúr and Joseph Miloslav Hurban proclaimed the first Slovak Government, the Slovak National Council as the "supreme Slovak authority issuing out of the bosom of the nation." That same year, in the historic demands known as the Nitra and Liptovský Svätý Mikuláš demands, the Slovaks pleaded ardently for autonomy of the Slovak territory, whose laws would be passed by a Slovak parliament.

Furthermore, they demanded: Slovak schools, Slovak courts, Slovak as the official language in Slovakia, and teaching in Slovak at the University.

In every Slovak demand, from May 10, 1848, and in every Slovak program the demand for a Slovak Parliament was predominant. It had deep roots.

To Brezová and Liptovský Svätý Mikuláš not even a hundred people came to the rally in 1848 to demand a Slovak parliament. In 1861, about 5000 Slovaks came together to demand a National Assembly for Slovakia. The Pittsburgh manifestation of May 30, 1918, was attended by some 30,000 people. But in 1938, on Pentecost Day (June 5th), about 120,000 Slovaks gathered in Bratislava at a historic rally to commemorate the twentieth anniversary of the Pittsburgh Pact. It was here that the Slovak nation saw the historic document which was proposed and signed by T. G. Masaryk in 1918. The Pittsburgh Pact, which in fact guaranteed autonomy to the Slovaks, was brought to Slovakia by a delegation of the Slovak League of America.

These manifestations show just how the concept of self-administration in Slovakia grew in depth in the wide masses of the nation. In 1848 it was supported by a small group of Slovak intellectuals, but in 1938, in Bratislava, practically the entire Slovak nation was back of it.

In a confidential report (T. 1370/33) to President Masaryk, Dr. Schnieszl wrote:

"Today all of Slovakia is for autonomy. Several pre-revolutionary Slovaks are completely insignificant for the spiritual life of the people. Moreover, if some were not bound by their past, and others by their public status, they, too, would be on the other side openly."

The Slovak newspaperman in America, Adalbert Tholt-Velkoštiavnický, was not familiar with the correspondence of old Slovak leaders, and yet he evaluated the political demands of the Slovaks quite correctly. He stated that they were demands not only for a narrow autonomy, but that their content actually called for the independence of Slovakia. It is interesting that Tholt came to this conclusion even though he was not acquainted with the significant quotation from Štúr's book "Slovanstvo a svet budúcnosti" (Slavdom and the World of the Future), which read:

"So that we could occupy and take over the place which belongs to us according to our strength and capabilities, we must once and for all time free ourselves from the unbearable yoke of foreigners and gain for ourselves state INDEPENDENCE, because a nation that is enslaved has its hands tied and must perish sooner or later."

What crystal-clear words! And Štúr said them openly and fearlessly after the sad experiences of 1848-49. Štúr states clearly that the penalty awaiting the nation which will not fight for its state independence is death.

After the national rally of 1861, the fight at home in Slovakia weakened; there was not a single public expression or demand voted on manifestationally which could compare to the demands of 1848 and 1861: in which a demand was voiced for a Slovak government, or a Slovak parliament. In Slovakia a hard fight was fought to preserve

Slovak schools. But the fight for the inherent rights of the Slovak nation was carried over into America. The question was taken up by the Slovak press and became the subject of several hundred public manifestations. Finally it matured with the "Memorandum of the Slovak League," which to a certain extent repeated the demands voiced in 1848 and 1861: autonomy for Slovakia, a separate Slovak Assembly or Diet, Slovakization of the schools, Slovak courts, and the use of Slovak in public life.

After this follow the agreements with representatives of the Czech nation. The Cleveland Agreement, in 1915, in which the Czechs agree to a federative form of the hopeful Czecho-Slovak Republic, and then the memorable Pittsburgh Pact of May 30, 1918, in which again is renewed the promise that the Slovaks shall have their own Slovak administration, their own Slovak schools and courts, and, above all else, their own Slovak parliament or state legislature. Even though Thomas Garrigue Masaryk undersigned this agreement on May 30, 1918, and then again on the second day following his election as President of Czecho-Slovakia, he later disavowed it, declaring it a falsehood and a mere scrap of paper. That is how the Czechs kept their promises.

If we call the period from 1655 to 1845 as the period which turned to the past, then we can call the period from 1845 to 1918 as the period presenting the program of the future. And this is followed by a period of active fighting for the recognition of promises and agreements. A short article does not allow us to take up in minute detail every parliamentary expression, every motion or proposal for autonomy, every public manifestation; and every reminder that promises made during the war be kept and fulfilled.

It remains a sad reality, but the historical truth nevertheless, that the Czechs did not live up to their promises any more after 1918, than they did after 1945. The fate of every agreement with the Czechs was the same: all agreements with the Slovaks were repudiated by the Czechs. The Czechs were willing to make concessions only when they needed the Slovaks; later, they repudiated every agreement. Practically all Czechs were the same in this regard: T. G. Masaryk, the so-called realist and humanist; Edward Beneš, the so-called "democrat and statesman," and Monsignor John Šrámek, the Catholic priest; Czech agrarians, democrats, socialists, communists and fascists; Czech Catholics, Lutherans, Jews, Taborites, Hussites, members of the "Czechoslovak National Church," Unitarians and Baptists: all repudiated the promises made to Slovaks, all repudiated the inherent and God-given right of the Slovak nation to freedom and state independence. No little wonder, then, that the Slovaks cry out today: Don't believe the Czechs — no more agreements with the Czechs!

Joseph Pekar, the Czech historian repudiated by Masaryk and Beneš, declared in his time that the Slovak demands were moderate. Was it not a terrible tragedy that these moderate and rightful demands were not realized in the Czecho-Slovak Republic? For twenty long years the Slovaks fought not only for their own parliament, but also for the Slovakization of their schools, especially for additional higher institutions of learning. Many of the demands of 1848 and

1861 were still timely even in 1938; and the demand for a Slovak parliament was the most important.

The Czechs, supported by Slovak Czechoslovaks (Slovaks in the service of the Czechs: renegades), proclaimed that there was nothing more dangerous for the Slovaks than a Slovak parliament. Vavro Šrobár, one of the foremost "Czechoslovaks," wrote a letter to Americans of Slovak descent to "prove" that point. Of course, to do so he had to give incorrect or falsified statistics; in fact, he outdid the Magyars in that respect. Šrobár used the false figures, representing the various nationalities of the population of Slovakia, to show that in a Slovak parliament the Slovaks themselves would be a minority, which the non-Slovak population — the Magyars, Jews and Germans — could outvote at any time. But he was not very convincing. During various negotiations with a Prague Government, the Czech ministers promised: We shall give you everything, but not a Slovak parliament. And the Slovaks answered adamantly: We want nothing except a Slovak parliament, because with it we shall realize all the rest of our demands.

Czech policy was incredibly short-sighted. Czech politicians and ministers would debate days on end in the Ministerial Council to send Czech mail-carriers and janitors to Slovakia to "help out" the Slovaks. And they usually did even against the will of the Slovak public and its representatives in Government. This only convinced the Slovaks all the more that without their own State Legislature or Parliament, they would actually be only a subordinate colony of the Czech nation. The more Prague opposed the idea of a Slovak parliament, however, the more the Slovaks demanded it. That was the situation up to October 6, 1938.

Czech diplomacy and democracy created such a situation that the Czecho-Slovak Republic collapsed with the first blow. Not a single shot was fired in its defense. In the annals of history there is probably not a single case where a political state disappeared with less ado about it. In the fall of 1938 it was clear even to those in power in Prague that the Slovak demands of 1915-1918 must be fulfilled. Even Beneš himself — who told the delegation of the Slovak League of America in 1938 that he was in principle against the Pittsburgh Pact only because of the one word "parliament" — began to see the light. On October 4, 1938, that very same Beneš wrote a letter to Dr. Joseph Tiso — a letter overflowing with reverence and kindly feeling — in which we find:

"The question of a parliament, designated by Mr. President in principle and only in the main outlines and in propositions, requires precise definition and precise legal formulation. The new Government, in agreement with the Slovaks, shall have to conclude the rest of this work as speedily as possible."

Beneš wrote the letter and corrected it three times, as was ascertained in the archives, but it was signed by Dr. Schieszl. On October 4, Beneš had it mailed, but that very day requested it returned to him, because, under pressure from the generals, he decided to resign the Presidency of the Republic. But what did Beneš have to propose about a Slovak parliament? Only this:

"It is agreed that future acts of administrative reforms, if it shall be based on the county system, shall preserve the unity

of Slovakia as a land and that a union of the counties be realized within the framework of the territorial parliament of Slovakia."

True, this proposition could not be seriously considered, because Beneš resigned his office and fled the country. The Prague Parliament finally voted the autonomy of Slovakia without Beneš on October 6, 1938. In December the first Slovak parliamentary elections were held, and in January, 1939, sixty-three deputies were seated in the first legislative assembly of Slovakia. Dr. Martin Sokol became the first president of the Slovak Parliament. The dream of Slovak generations was at long last realized.

The Slovak Parliament, just as every human work, had its shortcomings. But we must judge every mistake in the light of the times in which it happened. The Slovak Legislature began to function in extraordinarily difficult times, when the world situation was extraordinarily tense and confusion reigned in Slovakia.

Almost simultaneously with the Parliament, Slovak rule passed into the hands of the Slovak Government in October, 1938. State executive and legislative power in Slovakia passed into Slovak hands.

But the Czechs were not satisfied with this status of affairs. It was difficult for them to suffer the thought that the Slovaks would now decide about Slovak matters without Prague. They began to hinder development. They especially wanted to prove that their prognostications about the Czechs having to pay for the Slovaks were true. The financial policy pursued was such that it forebode the prediction of Kramář, that is, that if the Slovaks gained autonomy, they would not be able to pay their state employees even three months. They refused to give money for Slovak imports from the common fund, even though the Slovaks contributed to it, because now, they said, Slovakia is no longer a money-creating part of the state. Events were climaxed with a new occupation of Slovakia and the unseating of the first Slovak Government in March, 1939. When this happened, the recently executed Vladimír Clementis, in London at that time, wrote:

"... The unseating of Tiso's Government by Prague (better said: by Hácha, Beran and Chvalkovský — at the direction of Berlin) was negotiated politically in a very bungled manner, nay in a sinfully awkward manner" (*Hnev Svätý*, London, 1944, pg. 21).

The result of this intervention was that Slovakia tore herself completely from the Czech lands, and the Parliament of Slovakia by unanimous vote, proclaimed the independence of the Slovak State on March 14, 1939. Thus, Štúr's wish of 1850 was realized in 1939.

Shortly after the Parliament and government of autonomous Slovakia came into being, the entire apparatus of government — legislative and executive power — came into Slovak hands. And just about that time we witnessed an interesting phenomenon. From 1940, after the events of the so-called "Salzburg Intervention," we noted a change in the relations between the Parliament and the Government — which caused a serious tension and often threatened to explode into a sharp public conflict and wreck the whole structure of the State.

Vojtech Tuka wanted to remodel Slovakia completely after the German model; he was for National Socialism. Of course, he ex-

pected to become the first citizen of the remodeled State. Tuka and his followers began to intrigue against the Parliament, and the struggle climaxed with Tuka's demand that Parliament vote Tuka full authority, and that even in Constitutional matters. In a word, Tuka wanted dictatorial powers. According to Tuka, the Parliament was supposed to be only a representative body, which he would convoke once a year to hear some proclamation of his and then would solemnly and unanimously approve everything he proposed. Tuka wanted a "rubber stamp" parliament which would say "so be it" to everything he recommended, then go home and refrain from meddling in the politics of the State. Charles Murgaš, Chief of Propaganda, speaking in the name of the "leadership," declared that only one or two persons of the "leadership" would be able to play politics and, of course, he reckoned that he would be one of them.

According to these promoters of National Socialism, it was necessary to remove two personalities from government: Dr. Joseph Tiso and Dr. Martin Sokol. President Tiso delegated Dr. Sokol to deliberate about these questions. To the great surprise of Dr. Tuka himself, Dr. Sokol declared that he fully agreed with Tuka's proposal that the National-Socialistic system should prevail in Slovakia. And now, said Dr. Sokol, since things are done in this manner in the Reich — and here Sokol enumerated how various matters were transacted in Germany — we shall do likewise in Slovakia. In the first place, of course, continued Dr. Sokol, we know that in the Reich all State power rests in the hands of the head of the State — and that head is the President.

Dr. Tuka, immediately realizing that he was disarmed and in a blind alley, revoked his proposal for a National Socialistic Slovakia. He was fully aware that under the circumstances it could happen that he would drop out of government completely, if his proposal was adopted.

But peace did not ensue between Tuka, Mach and the Parliament. The deputies, who once sat in the Prague Parliament, often declared that the Prague Parliament could never have allowed such independent action against the Government as the Bratislava Parliament did during its whole existence. It often happened that the Government sent to Parliament a draft of a law for consideration and passage. When Parliament was through with it, the law approved was in most cases not based on the original draft, but was the opposite in its effects from what Tuka and Mach had intended it to be. There was no opposition to speak of in Parliament, but there was plenty of it against the Government. This had not only its good, but bad points as well.

Undoubtedly, if times were normal, Tuka's government never would have held together. Tuka and Mach, who represented one tendency in the Government, had practically no support in Parliament. Later on, however, even the other ministers could not have gained the majority, because, just as Tuka and Mach were reproached for being too radical and subordinated to the Germans, they, on the other hand, were reproached for being too colorless. Again it is true, that we could talk about the politics of Dr. Tuka and Mach, but hardly that of Dr. Pružinský, Fritz, Stano and Medrický. The latter were completely influenced by "Czechoslovak" circles.

Relations between the Government were not idyllic. Tuka's first attempt to dissolve Parliament ended ingloriously. But he and his followers did not give up easily. When Tuka categorically demanded that he wanted a new Government formed, which would include only Mach and Čatloš from the existing Government, he again was defeated. Tuka then demanded the President to appoint Charles Murgaš as Minister of Education, John Farkaš as Finance Minister, and a new man to head the Ministry of Justice. Tiso, however, remained adamant; he repudiated Tuka's demands. Tiso insisted on keeping the same Government he had after the Salzburg events of July, 1940.

After many rebuffs and bitter disappointments, Tuka's spirit and energy began to wane. He was an old, sick man, obsessed with the thought that he should have been the first man in the land, because he had, he thought, suffered for the cause more than any one else. His aggressiveness gone, Tuka in later years was a minister in name only; he was seldom seen in his office and was not in a position to make decisions. There was no change in government personnel until after Čatloš's flight to the putschists at the end of August, 1944. Čatloš was replaced by Stephen Haššík; Tuka by Dr. Stephen Tiso, who also took over Fritz's post (Justice and Foreign Affairs); Stano was replaced by Ing. Lednár, and Sívák by Dr. Aladar Kočíš.

Some people did not find it difficult to criticize the activity of individual ministers. When conversing with such bitter critics, I often asked the question: And what would you have done under the same circumstances? After a moment's thought, the critics usually answered that they probably would have done the same thing, because there was a war on, German pressure did exist, the situation was extraordinary and, hence, strongly influenced everything the Government did. Nevertheless, it remains indisputably true that as long as the Slovak Parliament and the Slovak Government ruled in Slovakia, the living standard of the Slovak people was higher than that of any neighboring country.

Let people say what they will about Sívák, the fact remains that while he was Minister of Education, more secondary schools arose than ever before, more Slovak professors were appointed to the universities, and at least three times as many students studied during the war than before or after it. We may criticize Tuka's actions, but the fact remains that he did not seek reprisals against the false witnesses, bribed by Prague as the Prague archives disclosed, who helped to convict him to 15 years in prison during the first Czechoslovak Republic.

During the administration of Julius Stano, more railroad tracks, roads and buildings were built than ever before. The fact remains that while Fritz was Minister of Justice, and even after he was replaced, there was not a single official execution in Slovakia. When Medrický was in charge of Slovak economy, there was no rationing of food and clothing. And when Pružinský was Minister of Finance, deposits soared to unheard of heights and the Slovak Koruna (Crown), one of the most prized means of exchange in the whole of Europe, enjoyed the legend of the Tatra dollar. Even Čatloš himself pursued a policy whereby Slovakia contributed as little as possible to the tax of blood.

Alexander Mach might be blamed for almost anything and everything, but perhaps no one man stood up so fearlessly against the German propaganda concerning the Germanism of the Habans, against the founding of German schools for Czechs who suddenly discovered that they had some German blood coursing in their veins. And it remains a fact that the Communists, even though their Party was outlawed, suffered less in Slovakia than elsewhere. It may sound strange, but it is true nevertheless, that Mach — this most Germanophile Minister of the Interior — used to sit at a white table with Communist intellectuals, converse with them, entertain them, and, above all else, protect them.

During the existence of the Slovak State, neither the President nor the Ministers of State had to fear going among the people without a retinue of armed guards. The President never wanted a motorized police escort, in fact, could not even use one going to the altar, the pulpit, the baptismal font, or into the confessional. President Tiso was truly loved and esteemed by all the people of Slovakia. If his political enemies be excepted, and they were only few in number, then we must say that even they respected him. What a difference between Tiso and Beneš! Tiso needed no protection when he went out among the people, but Beneš and his Communist-dominated regime had to have an army around them when they entered Slovakia after the war.

About the Slovak Parliament we might say what the followers of Ghandi were wont to say: "Even the worst Indian Government is better for India than the best English Government, because the English Government has no business in India." Similarly, the Slovaks can express themselves about every Czech government. The past has shown definitely that a **Czecho-Slovak** government is in reality always a **Czech** government, regardless of whether it follows a rightist or Communist tendency. A **Czech-Slovak** parliament always was and always will be a **Czech** parliament, even if it contains several Slovak members.

A nation which has matured does not want to be regulated or directed by laws that are promulgated by an alien parliament and then enforced by an alien government. That is so especially with a nation which has had its own parliament and its own government. The Slovak nation had its own parliament and its own government from 1938—1945. And the Slovaks still wanted to rule themselves, their Slovak Republic, after the war ended in 1945, but their will was violated. They were violently forced back into the political state which had exploited them for thirty years.

Slovak ministers, as people, could have and undoubtedly did have their faults, but one thing cannot be denied them, the one indisputable fact that they worked for the welfare of the entire Slovak nation as best they could under given circumstances, and the Slovak people never fared better under any other government — before or since that time. In a word, the Slovak ministers governed well. Not one of them became wealthy through politics; and they lived more modestly, more democratically than the present rulers of Slovakia, they cost the people less than the present commissioners.

The same can be said for the parliament. The work of the Slovak Parliament undoubtedly had its shortcomings. Circumstances and

events often tied the hands of the deputies, but we need not fear the criticism which history shall record about the Slovak Parliament. After the war many deputies were tortured and some were killed. Most of them received an average of ten years in prison. It is good always to remember this, when some Czech in the world says that the Slovaks never had it so good as they had it under the Czechs before 1939 or after 1945.

The fact remains that the Czechs in Prague oppressed and exploited the Slovaks before 1939 and, after 1945 avenged themselves by murdering Dr. Tiso and others, jailing, persecuting and dispossessing thousands of others, and exiling tens of thousands of Slovaks to Siberia and other regions of the Soviet Union and its satellites. The Slovaks at home and everywhere in exile know that they did not sell out the Czech people to Moscow, but that Dr. Edward Beneš and his followers sold out not only the Slovak nation, but the Czech people as well, to the tyranny of the hammer and sickle.



WHO SAID IT?

BENEŠ IN RETROSPECT: — "In an interview published in a London Sunday paper, REYNOLDS NEWS, on February 20, President Beneš of Czechoslovakia, emphatically declared that he does not fear Russia's return to imperialism under the pretext of a so-called All-Slav policy. The alliance and harmonious collaboration of the USSR, Poland, and Czechoslovakia would deter Germany from provoking another world war. Such an agreement may, therefore, have a far-reaching significance for the future peace of Europe as a whole. To the question as to whether the pact will not make Czechoslovakia too dependent on the Soviet Union, President Beneš replied that the pact represents the fundamental strengthening of Czechoslovakia's security and consolidates her independence. Friendship with Soviet Russia means a mutual collaboration. The Czechoslovakian people, as the most mature people politically in Europe, would never accept vassalage under any nation." — (News Flashes From Czechoslovakia, Chicago, Ill., March 20, 1944).



DR. HUBERT RIPKA:—"Many silly rumors and guesses have arisen concerning a quarrel with the Soviet Union about Carpathian-Russia. Many conjectures have been made about our Governmental delegate, Němec. These are all nonsensical speculations! The Soviet and Czechoslovak Governments are firmly resolved to proceed in all matters, now and in the future, strictly according to the Treaty. Governmental delegate Němec, with his political advisors and the representatives of the Slovak National Council, is already in liberated eastern Slovakia and in a few days will start working in Košice, to organize a new free life in liberated parts of Slovakia, according to the government on relations between the Government delegate and the Slovak National Council. President Beneš will also come soon to the liberated country, where, under his leadership, a new Government authority will be created, based on the will of the liberated peoples. Be calm and faithful. Liberation is in sight." — (London Broadcast, January 29, 1945).

JÁNOŠÍK — THE SLOVAK ROBIN HOOD

IVAN HOUDEK

Much has been written about Juro (George) Jánošík, the leader of the Slovak mountain boys, who has become the greatest legendary hero in Slovakia country, and undoubtedly much more will still be written about him in his native land where his name is an inspiration to both the old and the young. It is rather appropriate to recall, at this time, the exploits of his so-called rebel against society in his day, for Jánošík is the symbol of a people's just indignation against injustice and oppression, as well as a symbol of hope of ultimate victory of justice and of truth.

The sources from which we were able to draw a reliable character sketch of this remarkable man are twofold: the official records of his trial, and the numerous folk songs, stories, and legendary accounts of his exploits. The former are necessarily dry, the latter rich and varied. These sources represent people of conflicting views: the one class feared and hated the bold youth as its enemy; the other loved and immortalized him as a national hero. It is a difficult task to reconcile these widely divergent points of view and, yet, these sources, which give us two different pictures of him, are not really contradictory, but rather complement each other.

The original Latin-Slovak judicial documents were kept in a special file in the county archives of the Liptov District records, in St. Mikulaš, the county seat. Unfortunately, these disappeared rather mysteriously in the second half of the last century. Duplicates of these documents, however, have been preserved and their contents were first publicized by Gaspar Fejerpataky in the *Vlastenský Kalendár* (1831-1832). These are a faithful copy of the authentic record known as *Fassio Janossikiana*, dated 1713. In 1880, Paul Dobšínský published his views in the *Prostonarodné Obyčaje* (National Customs) in the Slovak Museum's publication of that year *Muž. sl. spol.; VIII, Podtatranský Juro Jánošík*. Paul Sochaň's *Zbojník Juro Jánošík*, published in 1924, is a good source of information and from it and the other contemporary records and legendary accounts which have been handed down for generations, we are able to reconstruct most of the scenes of the time and re-enact the events in the life of this popular hero, so that they may be considered to be truly historical, not merely legendary.

Both sources give Ťarchová in Trenčín County as his birthplace, where he was born about 1688. But research has indicated that Jánošík was actually born on a small farm in the highlands in the vicinity of that hamlet, and the spot today is marked by a small, dilapidated hut with the number "575" on it. It stands between two linden trees in a place called Janošov, which boasts of a population of 17 persons, most of whom bear the name Jánošík.

Jánošík was still a child when the revolution under Rakoczy II (1703-1711) took place, but he joined the insurgents, whose motto, "Pro Liberate," was emblazoned on their banner. Later, he joined the imperial army and was sent to Bytča Castle as a guard, where he met

one of the Emperor's prisoners, an adventurous brigand and soldier of fortune, Thomas Uhorčík. This fateful acquaintance proved to be the turning-point of his life.

Rakoczy's ill-fated rebellion was put down in 1711, and the youthful Jánošík returned home after being ransomed out of the army by his parents. Tradition has it that he became an outlaw and a highwayman because his father was flogged to death by the lord of the manor when he refused to leave the deathbed of his wife in order to work in the fields of his master. This fatal flogging took place in Ťarchová, at the village bridge, according to one account, and at the castle in Teplice in Žilina, according to another report. The judicial documents, however, merely record the fact that Uhorčík, who had escaped from prison, had come to Ťarchová and had persuaded Jánošík to join his robber band in the forest.

As a background to the future of Jánošík, it may be well to recall that social conditions in Slovakia at the time were, perhaps, at their worst. The Revolution had failed, but many a peasant's son was unwilling to bow down under the yoke of a feudal system after tasting freedom as a soldier of fortune. Conditions among the peasants in the kingdom of Hungary after the death of the liberal monarch, "Mathias the Just," became steadily worse until they became unbearable. The peasants' revolt under George Doža in Transylvania and in the Dolná valley was cruelly stamped out by the nobility, and the lot of the peasants was virtual slavery.

Although the right to emigrate was restored to the peasantry, in view of the fact that the people were subject to burdensome taxation and many restrictions, their status by the end of the seventeenth century had grown worse, so that in reality the nobility had assumed the right of life and death over its subjects. The Slovaks, especially, became the victims of a cunning and unscrupulous nobility which enslaved them. Frequent class struggles, wars, and plagues added to the misfortunes of the Slovak people. Many areas were reduced to poverty-stricken regions where extreme misery and want prevailed.

Northern Slovakia which had, perhaps, suffered the most in these trying times, became the home of the discontented, the discouraged, and the desperate. These men organized robber bands and preyed on the surrounding countryside from their mountain hide-outs. Thomas Uhorčík was a member of one of these bands as early as 1704. Jánošík became a member in 1711, after taking the brigand's pledge and sealing his oath with his blood. His exploits soon won him far-reaching fame not only in his own country, but also in Moravia, Poland, Hungary and Silesia. After being elected chieftain, the youthful bandit extended the zone of his operations from the eastern counties of Liptov, Spiš, Orava, Turiec Tekov, Malohont, and Šariš to Zvolen, Trenčín, and Nitra, and even crossed into Moravia, Silesia, Poland and Hungary.

His comrades were, according to his own admission: Thomas Uhorčík (Uhrík); Paul Gašparec-Mlynarčík from Rakov; Barte, the shepherd from Predmier; "Red" Ondraš from Dlhá; Plavčík from Dunajov; Gábor from Valkov; Juro Turiak (Huncaga or Hunčík); Kubo Chlastiak from Otožnic; Juriak, Satora, Gavel, and several Poles. Not a few secret accomplices, like Juro and Kubo Štukovec in Krásna, furnished him with supplies and information.

Folk stories about this interesting outlaw are, undoubtedly, guilty of several anachronisms. They list the following as his associates: Uhorčík, Gajdošík-Mlynárčík, Surovec, Hrajnoha, Adamčík, Ilčík (the chief scout), Garaj, Postavčík, Tarke, Mucha, Durica. Most of these, however, were not even Jánošík's contemporaries. For instance, James Surovec, from Rovný in Trenčín, who terrorized Orava, Trenčín, and Pohronie, was not born until 1715, two years after Jánošík's death, and he himself was executed in 1740. Hrajnoha, the famous dancer from Nitra, lived in the middle of the 18th century and was broken on the wheel in the Smolen Castle. In 1873 Hrajnoha's treasure was unearthed by some laborers who were building a highway near Nadaš. Adamčík was a notorious bandit in Moravia, and Ilčík lived in Trenčín. Garaj must have preceded Jánošík, because a brook is mentioned by that name in the judicial documents covering the trial of Slovakia's most famous outlaw. Some of Jánošík's associates are, perhaps, products of the popular imagination.

A triangular area, known as the King's Plateau, lies on a high point overlooking the counties of Liptov, the Hron area and Malohont, near Hochwald, or Hovald, at a spot known as the "Tall Pine," directly above the road running from Liptov to Spiš. This region was at one time covered with a thick forest, which was the hiding place of robber gangs in every century. Queen Maria Theresa destroyed this picturesque rendezvous of the highwaymen by having the forest cut down by royal proclamation. But in Jánošík's time, this area was the favorite haunt of brigands, and it was there that Lord Jáu Radvanský, while on his way to the funeral of the former revolutionary general, Petroczy, was robbed by the Slovak Robin Hood. Lord Paul Revay, Lady Schardon, and Lord Ladislaus Zmeškal were also held up in this region by Jánošík's merry band. Lord Skalka fell into their hands, as did Sipoš from Žilina, some horse dealers from the same town, several wine merchants, and many others.

Some of the booty was given to the poor and needy. Hence, the story circulated that Jánošík robbed the rich to give to the poor. This is not quite in keeping with the facts, for his comrades preyed upon the lower classes as well as on the wealthy nobility. The jewels taken from Lord Skalka were distributed among the young ladies in Ťarchová. Romantic tales, which have little historical basis, however, have become a part of the Jánošík saga in Slovakia. The authentic documents do not even allude to most of the feats attributed to Slovakia's legendary hero.

At his trial, Jánošík admitted that he often raided the sheepfolds of the lords of the manor, that some of the shepherds, either from fear of friendship, cooperated in these robberies and then accompanied him to celebrate at the "Black Ant" in Klenovce, owned by the inn-keeper, Martin Mravec, or at the "White Horse" in Dunajov, and sometimes at the "Blue Star" in Krásna, or the "Golden Eagle" in Ťarchová.

Winter time found the mountain boys seeking employment in the nearby homesteads because the snow would have betrayed their footprints leading to their hiding-places, deep in the pine forests of King's Plateau. Thus, Jánošík served as a farmhand in the winter of 1712-1713 at Kovalčík's and Ondrejčík's in Kokava. In the spring they hastened to their mountain rendezvous at the foot of the Tall Pine.

Jánošík's romantic career as Slovakia's Robin Hood was a short one, lasting less than two years. Although he escaped after his first capture at Klenovce in the autumn of 1712, he was caught in the summer of the next year. The commissioner at Malohont had granted him an amnesty after he had been confined in Jakoffy Castle in Hrachov, but after the county police of Liptov arrested him he never regained his freedom. No official record gives us the exact details of his final capture; but, according to tradition, Jánošík was apprehended either because of the treachery of one of his band, namely, Gajdošík, who had given away the secret of his chief's gigantic strength (the magic belt), or because of the treachery of Jánošík's former sweetheart, who lost her heart to the Police Captain Joseph Lehotský, when he came to her father's inn, the Golden Goose, in search of the renowned outlaw. The scene of his arrest, in the first version, was said to have been in the Little Mountain Inn in Polhora, Zvolen County, between Brezno and Tisovec. At any rate, the famed outlaw was taken in chains to Liptov, where he was lodged in Vranov Castle, built by Francis Palugyay. There, in a dark cell, Jánošík was chained to the wall to await his trial and death.

Jánošík was allowed to plead his case. He pleaded guilty to certain charges of robbery, but denied having committed crimes attributed to him. Some of the acts he was accused of were perpetrated while he was in prison. Thus, he denied having anything to do with the robbery of a priest from Orava, or the hold-up of Vitko from Silesia, the murder of the blacksmith's son in Dobrovce, the robbing of the Galusovecs, the looting of churches in Hungary, Poland, Silesia, or Moravia, where the sacrilegious robbers are alleged to have nailed the sacred hosts to a tree in order to determine whether blood would flow from them when shots were fired into them. He was also accused of having freed one of his band as he was about to be hanged in Žilina. It is noteworthy that the county sheriff, John Litiský, and the mayor of the town of Osčadnice were suspected of being overly friendly with Jánošík.

To all the charges of which he was falsely accused the stout-hearted robber-chieftain simply pleaded innocent. Attempts to prove that he was in collusion with other notorious brigands in Slovakia, Poland, and Hungary were unsuccessful. When he was accused of having shot a priest from Domaniže, it was proved that two of his associates, Turiak and Plavčík, had committed this dastardly crime in his absence. No crime, other than robbery, was proved against Jánošík, who never killed anyone. But in those days a thief, as well as a murderer, might be hanged.

Legendary accounts of the trial picture Jánošík as remaining silent about the identity of his comrades, but the official records indicate that he gave the Court a list of their names, but refused to reveal their whereabouts. As to the buried treasure, he told his listeners that it was hidden in a large fir tree opposite an oak on which a hand was carved indicating the exact location of the fir tree, in the glade where the road winds down from Jablonka to Klenovce. Lord Skalka's jewels he had hidden in the mountains of Handlov, although legends have it they were bestowed on the maidens of the village of Tarchová.

Jánošík was tried by the county court of Liptov, presided over by the vice-commissioner, Ladislaus Okolicsanyi, on March 16-17, 1713, in the county courthouse of St. Mikulaš in Liptov. The other members of the court were the magistrates of the four districts of Liptov county, namely, John and Andrew Rády, Andrew Andreanský, and Matthew Joob. The official prosecutor was Alexander Čemický, and the attorney for the defense was Balthasar Palugyay. The defense pleaded guilty to the charges of robbery and asked the clemency of the Court. Moreover, Jánošík promised to give up his former way of life and wished to become once again a law-abiding citizen. The prosecution, however, demanded the highest penalty and succeeded in exacting a two-fold sentence from the Court, so that the "double-dealing" prisoner might first pay the penalty for his lighter crimes by being tortured on the rack, and then by being hanged on the gallows to forfeit his life for his graver transgressions. This was in accordance with the laws of the Tripartitum of 1515, 1625, and 1655.

The death sentence was carried out on March 17 or 18, 1713, before a vast assembly of people, on the execution grounds of St. Mikulaš, on the Váh near the Paludzký bridge. There the young robber-chieftain was hanged on the gallows, and his lifeless body was buried beneath it as the custom of that time.

According to the popular legends, Jánošík, though weighed down by his heavy shackles, danced the "hajduchy" (a lively folk dance) four times around the gallows, just before his death. Another legendary story tells of a courier who came directly from the Emperor with his imperial pardon, but it was too late, for the daring youth, who had promised to recruit four regiments of soldiers for the Emperor, was already hanging on the rack. He refused the amnesty with the words, "Now that you have roasted me, you might as well devour me." He is said to have died after being suspended by his rib on the rack for three days.

All nature seemed to go into mourning for this youth, whose merry songs once resounded through the glen. The babbling brooks became silent, the animals in the forest ceased their activity momentarily in silent tribute to their departed hero. A sudden hush came over all, and his many friends, far and near, were overcome by sorrow at his passing. An annual penalty was imposed on Liptov by the Emperor for having sentenced Jánošík to death, and, until recent times, four measures of gold ducats were paid to the imperial treasury each year. That is the story in legendary accounts.

The people believed in Jánošík's nobility of character. It is said that his body was buried in a crypt of the church of St. Mikulaš, where it lies in state of complete preservation awaiting the day when a new Jánošík will arise and strike down the oppressors of his people. Many years after this sad event, it was reported that while some youngsters were playing near the town of Hajasov, one of the boys playfully lifted the corner of a nearby hut and hid his cap underneath. This feat of amazing strength reached the ears of the nobility, who quickly removed this new performer, whom they considered another Jánošík.

Jánošík's execution was the signal for the authorities to capture all the remaining outlaws still at large in Slovakia. Emerich Kubiny, the registrar of Liptov, was sent to Malohont with warrants to arrest

all suspects. In April, Uhorčík, alias Martin Mravec, was captured at St. Mikulaš, where he had married and settled down as a tavern-keeper, the proprietor of the Gray Falcon. He was given a hasty trial and condemned to die on the rack. An imperial decree was issued by which the county magistrates would be held responsible in the future for all banditry in their areas, and on April 17, 1713, the assembly at Liptov approved of the motion to round up the outlaws. The imperial marshal, John Palfy, arrived to enforce the emperor's instructions.

Authentic documents, with the record of Jánošík's apprehension and trial, make him out to be an ordinary highwayman, similar to hundreds of his kind who roamed about the country and terrorized the gentry. He was considered to be a dangerous character, as were the others of his notorious profession. Nevertheless, the fact that his name has become an illustrious one in the legendary songs and stories of his people, is in sharp contrast with the official picture of this colorful, albeit lawless, personality. The question arises, why has he, alone, maintained his position as an idol of the Slovak nation? Obviously, he must have been different from all his companions and contemporaries, both in vice and virtue. Although the aura of glory and honor that surrounds his memory is no doubt the result, in some measure, of the people's rich imagination, yet, his deeds during his life are an argument in favor of some outstanding qualities in his makeup. We cannot account for his tremendous popularity among the people, nor can we explain why his name is a symbol of virtue rather than vice, unless we attribute virtuous qualities to this youth who so fired the imagination of the old and the young that he has become the immortal hero of his native land.

The areas known as the "Queen's Meadow, Warm Springs," and many other regions in the Pohron and Malohont districts, abound even today in folk songs, ballads, and stories of his exploits in behalf of the poor and the oppressed.

We can safely conclude that the official records suppressed much of the truth in regard to Jánošík's actual personality and deeds. Since he was the self-constituted champion of the oppressed everywhere, one can understand why his name should be simply put on the list as an ordinary criminal by the oppressors, who used their power to liquidate all those who were dangerous rebels against their form of society. But despite their precautions, Jánošík's name, for almost two and a half centuries, has been the symbol of hope and courage to his people.

Unlike other parts of the Austrian Empire, which revolted from time to time (Magyar, Romanian, Croatian and Serbian outbreaks occurred intermittently in 1514, 1569, 1571, 1635, 1655, 1784, etc.), the Slovaks revolted only once. This uprising happened in the Potisie region when a rumor was spread throughout Eastern Slovakia that the nobility had poisoned their wells. It turned out, however, that the cause of widespread death was actually the cholera epidemic of that year, 1631. Historical facts make it evident that the Slovaks were a patient people who would not rise in rebellion in defense of their life as a nation.

Passive endurance and resistance under the merciless system of political oppression was, however, accompanied by the active revolt

of the more highly spirited Slovak youths, who rebelled against the existing order of things by taking the law into their own hands, and by retiring into their mountain strongholds from which they emerged at night to right the wrongs inflicted on their people. They paid for their daring and courage by their lives, sooner or later. But their spirit kept alive the spark of freedom and the love of justice in the hearts of the Slovaks. They were, to be sure, common felons and blackguards among the forest highwaymen, but Jánošík was not one of them. He was the true embodiment of his age, wild and untamed but not ignoble and ruthless, not savage and unrestrained, but gallant, generous, honest, and honorable with his people.

The first attempts to trace the popular series of Slovak poems, ballads, songs, and legends were made in the early 18th century. Tablic published a poem entitled "Jánošík, lyptovský loupežník" (Jánošík the Robber of Liptov) in his collection called *Slovenští veršovci* (Vol. II, 1809). Ján Kollár discovered several poems about Slovak highwaymen and published them in his *Národné Zpiewanky* (National Ballads) in 1834 and 1835. Slovak news-bulletins and almanacs contained poems and folk stories about Jánošík. The *Časopis a Sborník Muzeálnej Slovenskej Spoločnosti* (The Periodical and Almanac of the Slovak Museum Association) also published a number of works on Jánošík, based largely on early manuscripts found in the museums in Liptov and Ružomberok. The *Matica Slovenská* (Slovak Institute) planned to continue its splendid task of collecting these old publications, which are rich in folklore. By the middle of the last century, the last of the outlaws in Slovakia had disappeared, but the stories of their daring exploits continued to interest the common people because of their highly imaginative appeal.

Jánošík's fame is preserved for the ages in the many poems that have been a distinct contribution to his nation's literature. The following poems have immortalized his memory: Paul Šafarik's "Jánošík" in the *Slaveni pacholu Slovanských 1814*; Absolon Meško's "Pieseň Jánošíková," 1842, (*Slovenské Pohľady*, 1897, sqq.); Michal Hodža's poem in the *Mator*; Sáva Pepkin-Medňanský's "Jánošík" in his *Poezi*, Vol II; Ján Botto's "Piese: Jánošíková" in *Zpevy*, 1847, and "Smrť Jánošíková" in *Lipa*; Samo Chalupka's "Likavský Vázeň" in the *Orol*, 1846, "Na Kráľovej Holi," 1862, and "Junak," 1860; August Lojko's "Jánošíkov Stol" and "Jánošíková Podkova"; Jakub Graichmann's "Horní Chlapci" in the *Sokol*, 1860; William Pauliny-Toth's "Jánošík s milou"; Ján Čaják's "Jánošík" in the *Orol*, 1870, and "Jánošíková Náhrada," 1875; Jonas Záborský's "Smrť Jánošíková" in the *Slov. Pohľady*, 1894.

Paul Beblavý wrote an interesting historical story about him in the *Slov. Pohľady*, 1889; Augustus Marschal-Petrovský, a long novel, *Jánošík, Kapitán Horských Chlapcov*, in 1901. Samo Zdychavský wrote a play, *Jánošík*; Jonas Zaborský, a drama, *Jánošíková Večera*; Michal Skačanský, a tragedy, *Jánošík*, 1880; Lud. Kubaný, a play, *Horní Chlapci*; Júr Mahen, a moving tragedy, *Jánošík*, 1910; Frances Svoboda-Goldman, a historical drama; John Porod, a play, *Jánošík*, 1928, etc. Other articles and historical studies about him were written by the following: Gaspar Fejérpataky in *Vlastenský Kalendár*, 1831; Stephen Hýroš in his *Zámok Lykava*, 1876; Pavel Dobšínský in *Prostonárodné obyčaje*, 1880; Rudolph Pokorný's *Z potulek po*

Slovensku, 1883; Ján Bobula's *Jánošík*, 1863; K. Salva-Čebradský's *Jánošík*; Julius Botto in his article "Leopold I and Francis Rákóczi II" in the *Slov. Pohľady*, 1904 mentions *Jánoší*; Carl Kálal's *Slováci a Slovensko*, 1905, and his *Na Krásnem Slovensku*, 1903; Carl Dúbravský's *Jánošík*, 1911; Gregor Uram-Podtatranský's "*Juro Jánošík* in the *Sbor. Muz. Slov. Sp.* VIII, 1908; Jaroslav Tuma's "*Jánošík*," in 1911, *Naše Slovensko*; Michal Jiránek's "*Zbojnici*" in *Slov. Čítanka*, 1911; Samo Czambel's "*Jánošík*" in *Páričov's Ružomerský Kalendár*, 1913; Joseph Škultety's *Jánošíková Doba*" in *Slov. Pohľady*, 1913; Ignac Gessay in the *Almanac of the Slovák v Amerike*; Pavel Sochaň's "*Zbojník Juro Jánošík*," 1924. Ján L. Bella put Botto's poem "*Svadba Jánošíková*" to music for solo, with piano accompaniment and orchestration. Vítězslav Novák also composed an original musical score on the subject called "*Jánošík*," which is to be found in *Mladí*, op. 55.

Almost without exception the foregoing works presented *Jánošík* as the idol of his people, as portrayed in the folk songs and ballads which have become a rich heritage of the Slovak nation. In some he is a patriot, in others a young theologian who has been led away from his high calling by the cruel circumstances of his time, while in all of them, with one exception, he is depicted as a knightly highwayman who is devoted to his poor, oppressed people. The one exception is Pavel Sochaň, who endeavors to debunk all the legendary glory surrounding the name of *Jánošík* by basing his *Zbojník Juro Jánošík, akým bol v Skutočnosti* (The Real *Jánošík*) entirely on the case records found in the County Court House of Liptov. But this is, perhaps, the passing fancy of the times, to smash all the traditional idols of the past, and Sochaň is one of this class of modern iconoclasts. Despite his efforts and those of others to defame the character of the legendary heroes of yesterday, the fact remains that *Jánošík* has been an influence in popular Slovak poetry, literature, and drama, and his name is imperishable in the history of his people. Botto's poems, alone, would make his fame immortal.

Not only did Slovak and Czech writers devote their talents to the singing of his praises, but we find that the Polish author, Przerwa-Tetmajer, wrote a whole series of ballads about him, as well as a beautiful, touching poem about his death. His collection of fables, folk stories, folk songs, and poems (*Báje z Tatier*) was very popular in his native Poland. Vlad. Hnatjuk, the famous Ukrainian ethnographer, wrote a treatise on *Jánošík* in 1889, and included numerous Slovakian songs about this national figure in his collection of Russian, Slovak, Moravian, and Polish folklore.

Jánošík has been the frequent subject of creative art in his native country. Thus, his likeness appears on glassware, primitive paintings, pottery, etc., in which he and his gay mountain lads are shown dressed in green blouses, red and white breeches, shiny black boots, gaily colored hats with feathers in them, wide waistbands richly studded with gold, silver, and precious stones, and armed with muskets and hatchets (*valašky*). *Jánošík* always has the place of honor as the leader, while *Surovec* is shown brandishing his *valaška*; *Hrajnoha* shoots off the tip of a tall pine as he leaps high into the air in a playful mood; and *Gajdošík* plays his bagpipes, while the others dance to his mountain music. The Slovak artists, Mikulaš Aleš, Martin Benka, and Ján Alexy, have made paintings of *Jánošík*. The

sculptor Franta Uprka made a number of figures of Jánošík and his companions, the best of them being his sculpture of the entire group gathered around a bonfire on the mountaintop near the Tall Pine. F. Fulla executed a gorgeous linoleum design of the group. Vladyslav Skovczyłaś, a Polish artist, made several exquisite wood carvings of these Tatra mountaineers of long ago. Among them are one of Jánošík, alone, another of Jánošík and his sweetheart, one of his profile, and a fourth of his men on the march.

Jánošík's buried treasure has engaged the popular imagination everywhere in Slovakia for centuries. The probable hiding places most frequently mentioned are: Kozia Skala, located in the Šutov valley in Turiec; Jánošíkova Pivnica, a cavern near Balna in the valley of Nemecká Lupča; Biela Skala in the Suchá Valley near Liptov; and Zemský Kľúč. Belopotecký's Mss., 1835, now in the Liptov Museum in Ružomberok, refers to all these places, besides Pod Jedlou near Trnovec in Liptov, the Baránc Meadow near St. Andrew's in Liptov county, and many others. Pavel Sochaň's "Jánošíkové Poklady" in the Slov. Pohľady, 1922-23, and Ján Porod's "Poklad a iné povesti z okolia Bytče" also contain clues to the secret hiding places of gold, silver and gems. Numerous articles have appeared in the official publications of the Sborník Muz. Sl. Spol. in recent years under the title of "Jánošíkov Poklad. Emo Bohúň wrote a fantastic novel on the subject.

The following places have been named after the famous outlaw: Jánošíková Kolkáreň (Jánošík's Bowling Alley) located in Liptov; Jánošíkové Husle (Jánošík's Fiddle) in Malé Smrekovice; Jánošíková Jaskyňa (Jánošík's Cave) in the Prosiecká valley; Jánošíkov Stôl (Jánošík's Table) in Važec; Jánošíkové Sedlo (Jánošík's Saddle) in the Queen's Meadow; Jánošíková Stupa (Jánošík's Footprint) in the Gadierská valley, in Turiec; Jánošíková Stolica (Jánošík's County in the Vratná valley Ťarchová; Jánošíková Skala (Jánošík's Rock) at Lišeník, near Polhora, Zvolen county; Jánošíkov Chodník (Jánošík's Path) and Jánošíková Jaskyňa (Jánošík's Cave) near Tisovce; Jánošíková Podkova (Jánošík's Horseshoe) in the Rimavská valley under Zlamenečín Hill; and Jánošíkov Skok (Jánošík's Leap) at Dunajec. These and many other names will preserve the name of Jánošík even if all poems and stories about him disappear.

Jánošík's hat is in the Liptov museum in Ružomberok. It is made of cloth richly embroidered with gold lace and decorated with mussel shells, and is high and cylindrical in shape. His hatchet is now in the national museum at Budapest, while his pipe is in the Slovak Institute's collection. The famous belt, which had been given him by a fairy and was said to have given the Slovak hero preternatural powers, is now in the Slovak National Museum in St. Martin's in Turiec. A cane and two ancient pictures of his band depicted on glass are there also. Two pictures of him are in the collection of the Moravian Natural Museum in Brno. The Liptov Museum at Ružomberok has a photograph of his hatchet, a copy of the paintings in Brno, a copy of the original court records of the trial of Jánošík, several paintings by Fulla and Skoczylaś, and a large number of literary works. In Rovno, Joseph Buchčar is the proud possessor of an artistic leather belt, filigreed lengthwise with goose quills, which was found in his old mill in the course of some repairs. Although it is said that this belonged to Jáno-

šík, it was more probably the property of Jánošík's lieutenant, Surovec, as Rovno was Surovec's home town. The Tatranský Museum has six old Polish glass likenesses of Jánošík and his merry men, similar to the glassware in St. Martin's in Turiec. One, however, shows the outlaws carrying a bag of ducats, another has the picture of his sweetheart. The collection there contains four pistols, ten knives, four powder horns, and a bag in which the robbers used to carry their stolen ducats.

Beneath the paintings of these colorful personalities of Slovak folklore there is a brief explanation of the initiation of new members to the robber gangs. They were required to prove their prowess in shooting off the tip of a tree with a pistol, or cutting it off with a throw of the hatchet, by drinking a bottle of brandy, and then by performing the difficult "Robber's Dance." The initiation took place in the evening around their bonfire. Each outlaw was armed to the teeth with a hatchet in his belt, a brace of pistols, and a musket. Of course, there was the powder horn, the wide belt, the knapsack, a Hussar's hat, and the brightly colored shirt and trousers to make up the rest of their accoutrement. Jánošík's breeches were said to have been red and white in color.

It seems incredible, in view of Jánošík's fame, that no monument stands to honor his memory, or that no plaque marks his birthplace. But he lives in the hearts of his people, hence needs no image of iron or stone to remind them of his life and his deeds. No other record exists of the merry mountain boys who had been Jánošík's companions. Most probably they disbanded and under assumed names followed peaceful and honorable professions until the end of their lives. Uhorčík, however, was caught and executed; and "Red" Ondraš disappeared in the vicinity of Tešinka while Jánošík was still at large.

The woodlands grew silent and peaceful with the passing of Jánošík from the scene. The songs of his merry men were silenced forever, and the forests were left undisturbed for the deer, bear, fox, and wild boar as they went about unchallenged. And high o'erhead, an eagle on swift and silent wings surveyed the glen far below, abandoned and cheerless, for the happy throng of Jánošík's youths had dispersed, and their chief was dead. — (*Slovenské Pohľady*, V. XLV. Nos. 1-2, 1929).

• • •

WHO SAID IT? — "The Czechs have been at all times all too ready to look on most Slovaks as Magyarones and potential traitors, and have employed battalions of censors, police agents, and other customary instruments of unpopular Governments, which always end by making the situation worse than before. Neither the policy of Prague nor the attitude of the Czech officials in Slovakia was always either wise or tactful. The Czech Socialists, who played such a large part in the Government of the first years, incorporated all those Czech characteristics most obnoxious to the Slovaks. They were crude, they were ill-mannered, they were aggressively egalitarian, and they were almost fanatically anti-clerical, seeing in the churches in Slovakia a two-fold enemy, social and national." — (C. A. Macartney: *HUNGARY AND HER SUCCESSORS*; 1937, London).

EDWARD BENEŠ — STALIN'S STOOGE

DR. MICHAEL ZIBRIN

Even if we could hear recordings of all the telephone conversations which took place in Prague in 1948 and see all the stenographic protocols of the secret conferences of Beneš, Zenkl and Zorin, or those of the Czech and Slovak Politburo, many of us even then would not have a clear picture of how the Communist putsch of February 1948 could have happened in the Czecho-Slovak Republic.

But the fact is that the Communist putsch of February 1948 did not happen accidentally. And it did not happen because Beneš had deceived the people of his country, or because the Ministers resigned prematurely and without agreement. The fact is that the February putsch of 1948 has old roots. The victory of the Communists was the fruit of a long, systematic and relentless activity of the Moscow Reds and, we can say, the characterless leadership of "Czechoslovak" politicians and their old connections with Moscow and the Communists.

It is said that Moscow seldom undertakes anything which it cannot surely and successfully finish, i.e., it will not start anything unless everything is fully planned and prepared to guarantee success. Time has always worked in favor of the men of the Kremlin. And so, when the "Czechoslovak" Ministers lost their heads and resigned, Moscow gave the word and Stalin's general manager in Czecho-Slovakia, ZORIN, leaped into action. Gottwald and his companions had no trouble at all in taking over the Government of Czecho-Slovakia.

Looking into the memoirs and writings of Dr. Edward Beneš and Winston Churchill, we find that President Beneš betrayed the so-called anti-Stalin conspiracy of Marshal Tuchačevský and Rikov in 1937. The betrayal destroyed more than 5000 army officers and intellectuals who opposed Communism and wanted to put an end to it.

Beneš writes about the affair in his Memoirs on pages 33-34, and on page 231 he admits that it was he who had betrayed what was being planned against Stalin to the Soviet ambassador in Prague, Alexander Alexandrovský, Commissar of the hated OGPU, which later became the NKVD.

Churchill also wrote about the episode in his book. Describing political events of World War II, Churchill reproaches Beneš for his betrayal of Tukachevský, saying that thereby Beneš became the servant of Moscow and the NKVD. During practically every conversation with Beneš, Churchill returned to the theme of Tukachevský and reminded him that he had been taken in by an agent of the NKVD and was doing the bidding of Moscow. With Tukachevský fell not only the 18 who were convicted, but also about 5000 Russian officers, officials and intellectuals. And they were destroyed only because they wanted to do in 1936 what Stalin, Molotov and Litvinov did in 1939, that is make a temporary treaty with Berlin.

After that betrayal in 1937, Dr. Edward Beneš became the instrument and agent of the NKVD and served that agency because he was completely in their hands. Right there and then was prepared the way for all the shameful acts which wrote finis to the "regulated democracy" of Dr. Beneš. The followers of Dr. Edward Beneš, enjoy-

ing political asylum in free America and other democratic countries, do not like to talk about this matter, but even that is quite understandable.

From that moment in 1937, when Dr. Edward Beneš — according to the report of his own ambassador in Berlin, Dr. Mastný — gave the report of Tukachevsky's betrayal to ambassador Alexandrovský in Prague, he ceased to be a free man and the Calvary of the servant of Moscow and the NKVD actually began.

"When we consider what Dr. Beneš did from that moment on, we see that he did everything against the will of the western democracies who already had been shedding their blood several years when Beneš's Soviet friend considered the war with Nazi Germany as a private affair of the capitalist world.

In his book "Six Years in Exile," Dr. Edward Beneš expressed surprise that his former colleagues in Paris did not want to receive him and acted quite coolly toward him. Of course, Beneš was not surprised, but he only pretended to be. He knew that his former Paris friends were well aware of the fact that he had sold out to the Communist NKVD. His political friends — such as Gabriel Paux, the French Ambassador in Vienna from 1933 to 1939, described the actions of Beneš as "symptoms of a loyal adherence of Dr. Beneš to his Slav communist brother."

We recall that Beneš traveled to Moscow in 1943 against the wishes of Eden, Churchill and other statesmen. There he approved the sell-out of Ruthenia and cleared the road to Czecho-Slovakia for the Soviet Union. This he did without any regard to the will of the peoples of Slovakia, Bohemia and Moravia. Nay, even without the full consent of the "Provisional Czechoslovak Government" in London. The peoples of Slovakia, Bohemia, Moravia and Ruthenia certainly had nothing to do with it.

I recall the speeches of October and November, 1943, in the chamber of the "Czechoslovak State Council" in London. They were made not only by the admirers of the Kremlin, but also by the so-called civil politicians who were blinded by Moscow. Among them were Lauschman, Dr. Uhlíř and Paul Macháček. They strongly approved the journey to Moscow and insisted on going along with Communist Valo's proposition even if it meant the loss of asylum in England and the good will of the allies. Beneš simply had to go to Moscow, they said, because the "higher interests of our nations" demanded it. When Beneš returned from his trip to Moscow, he brought the request to Mikolajczyk and the Poles that they renounce a large part of Poland to the Soviets.

If any one should question the truth of my statements, I am ready and willing at all times to produce the reports of the "Czechoslovak State Council," the speeches of Lauschman and Uhlíř, and even Beneš's speech in its entirety after he returned from Moscow. They tell us clearly why the Communist putsch of February 1948 took place so smoothly.

Beneš played his game of politics not only within the limits of the State, but also acted as adviser to the Poles. Later, as related by Gabriel Paux, he even acted as adviser to his Rumanian friend, Minister Maniu, who ended his life in a Communist jail. It was Beneš who counselled Maniu to discard his policy of reserve toward the

Communists and trust them, because, he said, the Soviet guarantees were good. In the same manner it was that Beneš spoke to Iranian statesmen and even to Franklin D. Roosevelt. This is all confirmed by the articles which appeared in the September 1948 and March 1949 issues of the REVUE DE PARIS. There can be no doubt in any impartial observer's mind that Beneš did promote Stalin's stock wherever he went.

THE SELL-OUT OF RUTHENIA

After the first World War, the victorious nations acceded to the demands made by the people of Ruthenia (Sub-Carpatho-Russia) to annex Ruthenia to Czecho-Slovakia as an autonomous unit. This was accomplished by the St. Germaine agreement, which was concluded September 10, 1919. The Ruthenes insisted on parting with the Magyars and being included in a Slovanic political formation, such as Czecho-Slovakia.

During the second World War, when the powers again recognized the existence of Czecho-Slovakia, they did so in toto as far as its boundaries were concerned, i.e., with Ruthenia included. The United States of North America never withdrew their recognition of the Czecho-Slovak Republic, so it was not necessary for the U. S. to renew their recognition.

Beneš was well aware of that fact and governed himself accordingly. He nominated Dr. Cibere, a former agrarian and Magyar Communist who could not even sign his name in Ruthenian, to represent Ruthenia in the Czecho-Slovak State Council.

After Hitler attacked Soviet Russia in 1941, the bolsheviks in Prague turned their embassy over to Dr. Fierlinger and declared solemnly that they never recognized the Munich Pact and that Czecho-Slovakia must be restored in toto, i.e., as it existed before Munich. Of course, they did not mean that, but it was good propaganda. Ruthenia was the topic of several discussions in London. When Francis Nemec was sent to Ruthenia instead of Dr. Juraj Slávik, the awl began to show from the sack.

Nemec was not given a cordial reception in Ruthenia at all. The inhabitants everywhere were signing petitions, sponsored by the communist Petruščák, which stated that the Ruthenians no longer existed and that there were only Sub-Carpathian Ukrainians in Ruthenia who yearned to be embraced by their great mother, Ukraina.

After many long squabbles, Nemec finally got a message through to Beneš in London through General Pika. The telegrams that Beneš sent through Fierlinger were never seen by Nemec, because Fierlinger already then was Stalin's envoy and never a patriotic citizen of his own state. It is significant, therefore, that despite these experiences this same traitor Fierlinger was named, several months later, as the premier by Beneš.

Nemec was in a very trying position. When he wanted to be connected with London, he had to ask for permission to do so from the Chief of the Russian Staff so that he could travel to Moscow, where with the help of the radio connection of General Pika, who was the Chief of the Military Mission, Nemec could tell Beneš how matters were going and keep him informed on Fierlinger. The latter was doing right well. He still is a minister in the Prague Government, but General Pika was killed by the Communists.

When Nemec returned to Ruthenia, Beneš sent him several new aides as advisors, among them also Dr. Fedor Hodža and Dr. Cibere. The latter, however, was picked up by the NKVD as soon as he landed in Ruthenia.

Later Nemec was joined by other members of Lettrich's Slovak National Council, but that did not improve matters.

In January, 1945, Husák and Novomeský told the non-Communist representatives of the Council that Ruthenia was definitely lost and that it was time they realized it. He said the same thing to the Czech members of the London delegation who wanted to install the legal order which was worked out in London on the basis of "continuity of the Republic," that is the first Constitution, and according to the hapless proclamation of the London Czech Government of June 30, 1944, which proclaimed a united "Czechoslovak" nation and state.

At that time the Communists had asked the Slovak non-Communists whether it would not be more profitable to support the idea of a Slovak Soviet Republic so that the Slovaks could govern their own territory rather than adhere to the "Czechoslovak" ideology which denied the existence of the Slovak nation. They added that such a Slovak Soviet Republic could be promoted without difficulty, because the Slovak State still existed. Husák and Novomeský, however, did not get anywhere with their proposal. The Slovak non-Communists turned it down, declaring that it was contrary to the Christmas Agreement of December 1943, as well as the agreement which Ursíny concluded with Dr. Beneš in October, 1944, when he acted in the name of the Slovak National Council.

When Husák and Novomeský failed to promote the idea of a Slovak Soviet Republic in London, they immediately contacted and ordered their followers in Slovakia to present the proposal to President Joseph Tiso and the Slovak Government. But Tiso and the Slovak Government would not hear about it. Husák and Novomeský failed in their mission. Several months later, with many Slovaks in emigration, Clementis took up the tune, but he also got nowhere. Today all the leading Reds of Slovakia are awaiting trial for failing in their mission. Clementis has already paid with his life.

Ruthenia was lost. Beneš's delegation had to go to Trebišov and after that things went rather smoothly. Fierlinger made the propositions and Beneš accepted them. When he was returning from Moscow in March 1945, Beneš could no longer enter Ruthenia. In fact he renounced it solemnly on several occasions. Finally, Beneš had an agreement prepared which Fierlinger signed for the Czechoslovak Government with great solemnity in the Kremlin on June 29, 1945. No one, outside the Communists, agreed with this act of Beneš. No law, however, could contain or restrain Beneš. He acted dictatorially at any time that it benefitted him.

On August 24, 1945, without even consulting the Parliament, Beneš issued his presidential decree No. 4, concluding the pact between the USSR and the CSR. This decree was the basis for assigning new borders to Slovakia in the East. In October, 1946, everything legalized on the basis of foregoing decrees was published in the Collection of Laws and Regulations.

The text of the above-mentioned agreement is interesting, as well as significant. It begins with the words: "... being certain that the provisional National Assembly of the Czechoslovak Republic shall concur with this agreement ..."

Beneš did not wait. He and John Masaryk and Vlado Clementis decided matters without Parliament. As good prophets, they knew that Parliament would certainly approve the agreement!

Since Ruthenia was not a very big gulp, Beneš did not stop there, but became even more generous. On June 2, 1945, he issued decree No. 8; whereby a number of homes in the most beautiful section of Bubenec — in the modern section of Prague — were donated to the Russian Communist State to commemorate, he said, the great sacrifices the nations of the USSR had made on the altar of liberation of humanity.

Well, it is a fact that the bolshevik armies to a great extent did liberate Slovakia from a great many things the Slovaks could use themselves, but it certainly was not ethical or democratic to sign over whole streets to them without even consulting the nation about it. Only dictators act like that. And Beneš was a dictator by the grace of Moscow, even if only a temporary one.

Besides this generous gesture, several weeks later Beneš showed his appreciation to the so-called "liberator" of Prague, Marshal Konev, by giving him several very beautiful villas which were confiscated from the good citizens of Prague. From these villas Konev has a beautiful view of Prague. They are occupied by the Communist gestapo which was sent to Prague from Moscow to plan the enslavement and destruction of humanity and Christianity in Europe.

Such is the fruit of Beneš's activity — his collaboration with the men of the Kremlin and the hated NKVD.

IN THE MASTER'S FOOTSTEPS

What led to the defeat of democracy and to so easy a victory of Communism in Czecho-Slovakia in February 1948, that is a theme that will be expounded in as many books and dissertations as there are views on that subject. Consequently dates and events will be multiplied. However, it must remain indisputably true that the date of June 25, 1945, is a sad one, indeed.

On that fateful day the Czech socialist parties represented by Dr. Peter Zenkl, Fierlinger and Gottwald, got together and willingly concluded an agreement whereby the "National Front of the Working People" was formed. Since no one threatened the socialists, it was not clear against whom the National Front was established.

It is both interesting and significant that not a single Slovak attended that meeting and that among those who called it were Dr. Peter Zenkl, Dr. Hubert Ripka and other leaders of Dr. Benes' old National Socialist Party — the very same people who today are telling the American public and the world that they always hated the Reds and that the Reds ousted them from Government.

But the truth is something else again. The fact is that both Zenkl and Ripka welcomed the Communists, sought their favor, and wanted to win political prestige with the help of the Reds at the expense of the other political parties. Of course, today we know that they failed. The same thing happened to them that had happened

and is still happening to all those who try to collaborate with the Communists: The Communists exploit them for what they are worth, and then swallow them up or get rid of them.

The "National Front of the Working People" created a "Central Coordinating Committee," in which every affiliated party had an equal number of representatives. This committee had the task of coordinating the work of the socialist parties. The socialist bloc prepared the ground for the various activities which led to the suppression of political and religious freedom and were the first steps taken toward a socialist dictatorship.

The Czech Socialists and Communists agreed that the Agrarian Party would be suppressed, the Catholic Eagle organization outlawed and that Catholic youth, as such, would not be allowed to organize. Together they worked out a plan whereby the non-Communist peasant votes would be done away with and, at the same time, how these votes, together with the Communist-controlled peasant unions, would be brought into the Communist Party. They also created and later legalized the Communist trade organizations, then the non-political Federation of Farmers and the United Youth Organization — all of which were supposed to be formed by the joint participation of all parties, but actually served only to communize Czecho-Slovakia from the time they began to function.

Therefore, it is not true that Zenkl, Ripka, and Vilem, and other Social Democrats opposed Communist hegemony from the beginning, but the truth is that from the moment they accepted the so-called "Košice Agreement," they were always subordinate to and in the train of the Communist Party and willingly continued that way not only on Russian soil, or in Russian-occupied Košice, but also in "liberated" Prague. Even the "Joint Declaration" to the nation of June 28, 1945, is indisputable proof of the fact that they wanted to get into government with the help of the Communists even at the expense of democracy, Christianity and freedom.

This is a sound lesson for all who would collaborate with Communists. All such people are digging their own graves, because Communism recognizes no agreements, concessions or compromises, and swallows up all who collaborate with it. This was made quite clear in the case of Husák, Clementis and Novomeský. They were exploited by the men of the Kremlin as long as they were needed to install Communist dictatorship over the Slovak people. But once that task was accomplished, they were discarded.

In like manner the Communists dumped Zenkl and Ripka, and their companions, and replaced them with Dr. Neuman, Ing. Šlechta and others; but even the latter will wind up the same way as Clementis and his companions did. So will also those non-Communists in Bratislava who even today try to collaborate with the Reds. But not all will be lucky enough to escape Red "justice."

Zenkl, Ripka and their companions pose as martyrs of Communist injustice as they bask in the sunshine of American freedom, but the fact is that they were a substantial part of the "National Front of the Working People" and, therefore, helped to install the reign of Communist injustice in Czecho-Slovakia in 1945.

• • •

ARE THE SLOVAKS AND CZECHS TWO "CLOSELY RELATED" NATIONS?

DR. A. GRÉBERT

Official propaganda of all Czech governments from 1918 to 1938 (the era of T. G. Masaryk and Edward Beneš) stated categorically that the Slovaks and the Czechs were "two very closely related" nations. We say "Czech" governments advisedly, because the Slovaks had little or no influence in them; the will of the Slovak nation was totally ignored when it came to policy and national and international relationships. The "Czecho-Slovak" (with or without the hyphen) administrations during that time were in reality "Czech" administrations; "Czecho-Slovak" government was in fact a "Czech" government. Even the national "Czechoslovak" church was strictly a "Czech" enterprise.

During and immediately after World War I, T. G. Masaryk and Edward Beneš had to offer some "logical" reasons for the creation of a joint political state for the Czechs and the Slovaks, because President Wilson had insisted on the application of the democratic principle of the right of self-determination to all nations. So, T. G. Masaryk and Beneš set out to prove that the Slovaks really were not a distinct nation, but only a branch of the Czech nation, and that the Slovak language was but a dialect of the Czech language. The Czecho-Slovak Republic was born of this "big lie" in 1918. Since that time, the "big lie" was promoted constantly by the propaganda apparatus of the Czecho-Slovak state. Many non-Czech politicians, statesmen, historians and writers succumbed to it. Among them were some who repudiated the concept of a "common state," but still thought that the Slovaks and Czechs were, nevertheless, "two very closely related" nations.

Among the factors which decide the individuality of a nation, we find: the natural framework within which a nation lives, its racial composition, language, cultural influences, literature, religious development, social structure, economic relations, etc. Now, how "very closely related" are the Slovaks and the Czechs?

IN THE BEGINNING THERE WERE TWO NATIONS

The Slovaks and Czechs already at the beginning of their recorded histories were not members of one nation, or a common political state, as most Czech politicians, historians and writers — and many uninformed non-Czech commentators, writers, historians and politicians, influenced by or in the pay of Czech propaganda — would have the world believe. There is nothing in recorded history to indicate that the Slovaks and the Czechs did not go separate ways. This historical fact was upheld even by such a typical representative of political and cultural "Czechoslovakism" as Dr. K. Krofta (*Tchéques et Slovaques jusqu' à leur union politique*, in the *LE MONDE SLAVE*, March-April, 1933, pg. 2).

Chroniclers of the ninth and tenth centuries clearly distinguished between the two nations. Paul J. Šafárik cited many examples to prove this point in his "Slawische Altertümer" (Vol. 2, pages 208, 458, 493). The differentiation between the Slovaks and the Czechs, however, be-

gan a long time before that. It already began in their ancient, prehistoric, common Slavic homeland. Later, in their new homelands, the individuality of both nations became more pronounced.

NATURE SEPARATED THEM

The Slovaks are a nation whose core lives in mountains and hills, whereas the core of the Czech people inhabits plains. And mountains and hills generally breed an altogether different type of man, psychologically and even physically, than do the lowlands. Rivers of Czech lands empty into the North Sea, whereas the rivers of Slovakia, with the exception of the Dunajec, flow into the Black Sea. With the rivers even Slovak life gravitated in a different direction from the life of the Czech nation. The Czech lands, on the one hand, and the Slovak lands, on the other, represent two very distinct geographical environments, which tended to create two distinct national individualities. In some Czech propaganda publications designed for the English-speaking world, it is even admitted that after one crosses the Czech border into Slovakia "we have the impression that we have come to a different world. Nature is different and the people, too, is distinctly different" (J. Czech—J. E. Mellon: "Czechoslovakia, Land of Dream and Enterprise," pg. 132).

If nothing else but nature separated the Slovaks from the Czechs, it undoubtedly would suffice to create and to preserve the distinctly special individuality of the Slovak nation. But the Slovaks were unlike the Czechs in other respects as well.

RACIAL COMPOSITION SEPARATED THEM

The Czech nation, surrounded on three sides as it is by the German world, undoubtedly was open to racial influences of that world. The racial structure of the Slovaks, on the other hand, was influenced to some extent not only by the Germans, but also by the Slavic nations (Poles, Ruthenes, Czechs) and the Uralo-Altaic Magyars, Avars, Pechengs, Cumans, Turks, etc.

The Avars ruled over the land of the Slovaks almost 250 years (to the end of the 8th century) and, hence, certainly must have had some influence on the racial structure of the Slovak population, held in bondage. And history tells us, too, that the Slovaks lived in a common political state with the Magyars over 900 years; and close to the Turks, when they conquered most of Hungary, for some 150 years. And we know that the Poles ruled the Spiš region of Slovakia from 1412 to 1772. The racial structure of the Czechs was not affected by these influences.

Hence, we are inclined to agree with Podhradzsky that racial composition "sharply separates the Slovaks from all the neighboring nations and in a special manner defines their place among all other nations of the universe" (*A tótoklata feldöld politikai és kultúrgeográfia*, pg. 53).

THEY SPEAK DIFFERENT LANGUAGES

Professor Louis Novák once wrote that the Slovak language was a "very ancient" lingual formation, one "which has had an original and independent evolution, quite different from the Czech language." And he added that "the language of central Slovakia today is the

direct organic continuation of the older central Slovak tongue, which in turn was the direct organic continuation of the respective pre-Slavic dialect" (*Jazykovedné glosy k čsl. otázke*, pg. 89).

Professor Henrich Bartek, noted Slovak philologist who made an exhaustive study of the Slovak and Czech languages, concluded that "the Slovak language in many of its aspects had a different evolution than the Czech language and this fact guarantees it an independent place in the family of Slavic languages" (*Príspevok k dejinám slovenčiny*, pg. 117).

The differences between the Slovak and Czech languages are greater than most people are aware of, especially people who have been confounded by Czech propaganda, Czech schools and books. The Czech language belongs to the group of languages which have a preponderance of the higher vowels, and it has sounds or vocals which are not to be found in Slovak. On the other hand, we find various vocals in Slovak that are foreign to the Czech tongue. The Slovak employs an abundance of diphthongs, while the Czech has only a few. The central dialect of Slovakia, the basis of literary Slovak, has only one declension of adjectives, while the Czech has three. They also differ greatly in the matter of inflection of nouns and verbs. Rules of accent, syllable formation, rhythm, composition and syntax, and word formation are also different. The languages are different lexically, too. Miroslav Kálal, Czech lexicographer, collected over 35,000 words in three years for his differential dictionary which are not found in Czech, or which have an entirely different meaning than the corresponding Slovak words. The language question has been dealt with in great detail by Trnovský; if the reader is interested he might consult his work "*K rečovej otázke Slovákov*" — especially pages 126—157 (published by the "Spolok sv. Vojtecha," Trnava, 1937).

Little wonder then that M. Sečenský wrote a book (about 1700) for Slovaks "living in Hungary" who wanted to learn Czech. The book, called "*Swětlonos Český*," would teach talented and industrious Slovaks how to read Czech correctly in a week and eventually how to distinguish between words and write correctly in Czech. This also proves that the Czech language was a foreign language to Slovaks, who had to learn it just as any other foreign language, if they wanted to acquire the use of it.

But even if the Slovaks did speak the same language as the Czechs, would that be a valid argument for the formation of a "Czechoslovak" nation, ethnically speaking? Certainly not. And it is less valid as an argument for a joint state life. We have German-speaking Swiss, French-speaking Belgians, English-speaking Irish, South Americans speaking Spanish and Portuguese. When books are written in the same language, they often belong to distinct literatures. And the Slovaks are indisputably distinct from the Czechs with their independent Slovak literature, which is the expression of Slovak cultural individuality.

THE PAST SEPARATES THEM

The Slovaks and Czechs never formed a joint state up to 1918. True, Svätopluk annexed the Czech lands to the Slovak state and held them a few years, but these were politically completely autonomous under their own Czech princes. History tells us, too, that the Czechs used the first opportunity that came their way to break away from the Slovak state with the help of the Germans. While the Czechs lived in

the broad framework of the German empire, "the Roman Empire of the German nation," that is within the framework of the Austrian Empire, the Slovaks on the other hand, were within the framework of the Hungarian empire. These were two distinct worlds, which could not remain without influence on the political thought, cultural development, economic conditions and social status of both these nations.

"We Czechs know well," wrote the "Narodní Listy" (National News) at the end of the last century, "that even the strongest movement, which stirred our nation in all Czech lands from the lowest to the highest strata, was halted at the Hungarian border. The entire past does not show even a single example that at home in Bohemia (Czechia), or again in Slovakia, there was evident any desire for a political union of the Czechs and Slovaks, not even at the time when the Czech kingdom was independent and the Czech nation the ruling element in it."

The economic history of Slovakia was altogether different from that of the Czech lands. While in the Czech lands, under the influence of the industrialization policy of the Habsburgs, capitalistic forms of economy began to take root comparatively very early, in Slovakia the conservative nobility, with the aid of the dominant position it held in the Hungarian state, successfully defended feudalism until the middle of the nineteenth century. In Czech lands, capitalism could thus begin much sooner to form the Czech person, while in Slovakia the Slovak person still lived a long time back and worked and was influenced by the economic forms of feudalism. To this very day there have been preserved in the Slovaks and Czechs distinct traces of this varied economic development.

CZECH ORIENTATION SEPARATES THEM

While the Czechs lived primarily under the cultural influence of the German world and looked out into the world through the medium of German windows, the Slovaks lived in an entirely different cultural environment. Medieval Hungary gravitated more towards the culture of the Italian peninsula, to Roman culture. Besides that, Hungary on its southern and eastern borders was in contact with the culture of the Byzantine-Slavonic world. Into all this came the culture of an Asiatic nation with its own particular flavor: the culture of the Magyar nation. F. Wollman, a Czech university professor, pointed to the intensity of Roman cultural influences on the Slovaks. According to him, the Slovaks are in substance similarly Romanized as the Poles are. While the Czechs represent a type of culture common to Germanized Slovans (Slavs), the Slovaks are a type of Romanized Slovans ("Východ, východnost, východnictví," in *Nová Svoboda*, Feb. 20, 1924).

RELIGIOUS TRADITIONS SEPARATE THEM

While the Czech religious organizations were influenced by the German world, the Slovaks were in direct contact with Roman Christianity. While Hussitism, Protestantism and the Czech Brethren left deep traces in Czech religious history, the religious development of the Slovaks went in an entirely different direction. It is very significant and most highly characteristic that Hussitism, which is perhaps the most marked manifestation of Czech religious development, and one which took hold to some extent in southern Hungary, mainly

among the Rumanians, evoked practically no response in the Slovaks, as was demonstrated by Prof. Varsík in his book "*Husiti a reformácia na Slovensku*" (The Hussites and the Reformation in Slovakia). Similarly the movement of the so-called "Czechoslovak Church," which cost Czech Catholicism over a million souls, remained completely without response in Slovakia. The national "Czechoslovak" church was strictly a Czech enterprise with nothing Slovak about it. The name, of course, was meant to confuse the little-informed and deceive the world in general. This holds for practically all things called "Czechoslovak."

While in Bohemia, in 1930, over 10 per cent of the population was without any religious faith, in Slovakia only 0.51 per cent belonged to that category — and the greatest part of this was made up of immigrant Czech officials, soldiers and police. Indirectly, the distinctness of religious traditions is also shown by the distinct stand taken by the Czech collective toward Communism: the Czechs are less negative towards it than are the Slovaks.

SOCIAL STRUCTURE SEPARATES THEM

While in Czechia, in 1921, only 29 per cent of the inhabitants was engaged in agriculture, in Slovakia 60 per cent of the inhabitants belonged to that category. In Czechia 46 per cent of the inhabitants lived from industry and business, in Slovakia only 21 per cent. It is not necessary to stress that people and nations living from agriculture, represent an altogether different type of person and nation than peoples and nations engaged in business and industry.

The varied social and economic structure of both these nations and countries appears in other rubrics of statistics. The density of the population in Bohemia is about 128 inhabitants per square kilometer, while in Slovakia it is only 62. The biological potential is different also: in 1932, 17.10 living children were born for each 1000 Czechs in Bohemia, while in Slovakia 28.46 Slovak children were born. The Czechs belong to the group of biologically very weak nations, while the Slovaks belong to the group of nations which are biologically strong. While a large part of the Czech nation lives in small towns, the core of the Slovak nation lives in villages. The dominant Czech type is the small-townner and industrial worker, while the Slovak type is the agriculturist.

ŠVEJK VERSUS JÁNOŠÍK

These actualities engraved their own deep traces on both nations. It did not happen by chance that the rational, materialistic, calculating "small Czech fellow" found adequate expression for the most popular of his own people's hero in the figure of the legendary "good soldier *Švejk*" (Shveyk). We find nothing like him with the Slovaks, whose most typical and most popular type of people's hero is the rebel *Jánošík* (Yahnowsheek), the romantic, idealistic, magnanimous and heroic Slovak Robin Hood.

Švejk fights against Austrian hegemony with a hunched back, with cunning and stealth, petty "sabotage," and with poisonous needles. *Jánošík*, on the other hand, goes into the mountains, fights heroically and rallies the people until he dies for his ideal. *Švejk*

and Jánošík stand against each other as two absolutely distinct, special figures of popular "resistance" types of two absolutely distinct national individualities.

TWO DISTINCT WORLDS

There is no doubt that the Slovak and Czech worlds are two substantially distinct worlds. "Slovakia is a component part of our Republic," wrote the Czech newspaperman Václav Kaplický in the "Svobodný Zítřek" (Free Tomorrow) of July 24, 1947, "but it is, nevertheless, still foreign to us, unknown; a different people lives there and there are there altogether different conditions of life than in our country."

Similarly, the French university professor Ancel, after a stay in Slovakia, declared that "the vital forms of the Slovaks are just as distinct from Czech life as they are from Magyar life" (*Les frontières slovaques*, pg. 28). A Swiss correspondent, after studying life in Slovakia, wrote: "Only 800 kilometers separate Bratislava from Prague, but arriving in Slovakia, you meet with the sounds of a different language, a different manner of life, a different manner of thinking, a different political atmosphere" (*Journal de Geneve*, September 30, 1947).

Today the Slovaks and Czechs are more distant from and more alien to each other than they were a thousand years ago, or than they were even in 1938. And as time goes on, these national individualists will be even more pronounced. This statement is based on the self-evident sociological development, which no one will be able to stop or alter. It will go on whether any one likes it or not. The so-called "Czechoslovaks," together with their Czech masters, are effectively speeding this process with their limited, short-sighted, unrealistic policy. Once history undoubtedly will prove this convincingly.

We have mentioned only the most important actualities, which acted together in the different formation of the Slovak nation and the Czech nation. The narrow framework of this periodical does not allow us to go into more detail. But the facts presented clearly indicate that the expression referring to the Slovaks and Czechs as "two very closely related nations" simply will not stand up under the critical eye of scientific analysis. Conversely, it is very striking that these two neighboring nations have so little in common.

TWO DIFFERENT MISSIONS

Not only the past and present separate the Slovaks and Czechs, but the future as well. The mission of the Slovak nation is in substance altogether different from that of the Czech nation. The geopolitical function of Slovakia is distinct from the function of the Czech lands. While Slovakia occupies the central location in the defense of the Central-European area, Czech territory occupies the border position. While the Czech lands have a defensive role against the pressure of the German world in the Danube Basin, Slovakia is supposed to have a coordinating role, and that not only toward German pressure, but even toward incidental Russian pressure.

After the first World War the victorious powers gave Slovakia the role to be "a support of the Czechs against German pressure.

This conception proved to be ineffective. The Danube Basin, or Central Europe, can be defended only with joint forces. And that is possible only when Slovakia will not be the cause of any Czecho-Magyar or Czecho-Polish antagonisms. That will be so only when Slovakia is independent. Then she will be able to fulfill the function of a consolidating and coordinating factor in the political atmosphere of Central Europe.

• • •

WHO SAID IT?

"It is difficult, nay right impossible, in a short article to note even in slogan form the things that are connected with historic November 7, 1947, for the USSR, for us, for Europe, for the whole cultural world. But one thing can be expressed and interpreted fully. And that is the sincere, deep hearty and undying gratitude of all Czechs and Slovaks to the Soviet Union, to its people, to its Army and to its skipper, Generalissimo Stalin, for everything they have done and still are doing for us. It is an unfalsified, selfless and clean feeling of friendship and sympathy, which we have for this great country that is so close to us and is our neighbor. It is a pure joy from the joys, the successes and the progress of the USSR; it is the inflexible hope that Slavdom, in its own new perception, will assure for itself and the world the deserved peace, in which all nations shall live according to their manner, freely, without fears, democratically and with dignity, as well as in understanding, prosperity and happiness. In this spirit, from my soul I greet the jubileeing USSR, and congratulate it from my heart for the results attained in peace and war. I wish it to continue to prosper, grow and become mightier unto its own greatness, but also for the welfare of all humanity. Long live the Soviet Union, and may its leader and skipper, J. V. Stalin, live in full health to see many more jubilees!" — (Dr. Joseph Lettrich, President of the Slovak Democratic Party and the Slovak National Council; ČAS, November 7, 1947.)

• • •

"Czechoslovakia and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics have united in the midst of fire and blood — this alliance, therefore, is for eternity, as love and friendship proven in affliction..... We are aware of the fact that the USSR could still exist without us, but our free State certainly could not exist without the USSR.... Long live the victorious Soviet Army! Long live its Supreme Commander, Generalissimo Stalin! Long live the liberator of Bratislava, Marshal Malinovský!" — (ČAS, the official organ of Lettrich's Democratic Party, April 4, 1947.)

• • •

"In parliament on November 7, 1935, when I spoke about the international situation, I said that it was my deep conviction that our contacts with the Soviet Union shall be good and lasting, that Soviet Russia will again become a powerful Slovanic factor, and as the most powerful Slovanic factor would bring Slavdom much good. We are not changing our stand — and this is the permanent stand of the Democratic Party." — (John Ursíny, Vice-Premier of Czecho-Slovakia and Vice-President of the Democratic Party, in Bratislava, February 22, 1947, according to ČAS, official organ of the SDP, February 27, 1947.)

YOU CAN LEARN SLOVAK

as easily as you can any other modern language. Slovak should be a **MUST** for students of Slavonic languages, because it is the simplest of all of them and a **KEY** to all of them. Prove it to yourself with the most scholarly text on Slovak, the

SLOVAK LESSONS

A practical study of the Slovak Grammar, 92 lessons, 400 pages; exercises in Slovak and English; English-Slovak and Slovak-English vocabulary. Hard cover, bound in cloth, \$3.50

HROBAK'S ENGLISH DICTIONARY — the best and most complete dictionary of its kind; 702 pages with a brief summary of the Slovak Grammar. Hard cover, bound in cloth, \$4.00

THE SLOVAKS, by Peter P. Yurchak, should be read by all students interested in the history and traditions of the Slovak nation; 312 pages, hard cover, bound in cloth — \$3.00; paper cover — \$2.00

SKETCHES FROM SLOVAK HISTORY

by Joseph Škultéty, translation by O. D. Koreff; a documented refutation of several errors propagated by writers and historians; 229 pages, hard cover, bound in cloth — \$2.00; paper cover \$1.00.

Order from:

P. A. HROBAK

Box 150

Middletown, Pa.



Sept. 2, 1855 – REV. STEPHEN FURDEK – January 18, 1915
Organizer, publisher, writer, champion of Slovak freedom.

Born in Trstená, Orava County, Slovakia, died in Cleveland, Ohio. Founder of the First Catholic Slovak Union of the U. S. A., the First Catholic Slovak Ladies Union of the U. S. A., and the Slovak League of America. Furdek is referred to as the apostle of Americans of Slovak descent.